# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF	AMERICA,	)	
	Government,	)	Case No. 17-CR-124 Milwaukee, Wisconsin
vs.		)	
MARCUS HUTCHINS,		)	May 16, 2018 1:30 p.m.
	Defendant.	)	-

### TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE NANCY JOSEPH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE

Official Court Reporter: Richard Derrick Ehrlich, RMR, CRR richard\_ehrlich@wied.uscourts.gov (414) 290-2642

Proceedings reported by stenotype. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

	APPEARANCES
For the Government	:
	Michael J. Chmelar
	Benjamin Proctor United States Department of
	Justice (ED-WI) Office of the U.S. Attorney
	517 E. Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53202 414.297.1582
	michael.chmelar@usdoj.gov benjamin.proctor@usdoj.gov
	Demjamini.proccoreusaoj.gov
For the Defendant:	
ror the berendant.	Marcia C. Hofmann
	Zeitgeist Law, PC 25 Taylor Street
	San Francisco, CA 94102 415.830.6664
	marcia@zeitgeist.law
	Brian E. Klein Baker Marquart, LLP
	2029 Century Park E Suite 1600
	Los Angeles, CA 90067 424.297.1728
	Daniel W. Stiller
	D. Stiller, LLC P.O. Box 511130
	Milwaukee, WI 53202 414.207.3190
	dan@dstillerllc.com
Marcus Hutchins, De	efendant, present in person.

1	INDEX	
2	Witness	<u>Page</u>
3 4 5 6 7 8	Lee Chartier  Direct Exam by Mr. Chmelar Cross-Exam by Mr. Stiller Redirect Exam by Mr. Chmelar Recross-Exam by Mr. Stiller Exam by The Court Further Exam by Mr. Chmelar	13 44 78 83 84 86
9	<u>Jamie Butcher</u>	
10 11	Direct Exam by Mr. Chmelar Cross-Exam by Mr. Klein Redirect Exam by Mr. Chmelar Recross-Exam by Mr. Klein	87 108 149 153
12	Exam by The Court	153
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 THE CLERK: Good afternoon. We are here for 2 United States vs. Marcus Hutchins. Case No. 17-CR-124. 3 May I have the appearances, please, beginning with 4 the plaintiff? 5 MR. CHMELAR: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael 6 Chmelar and Benjamin Proctor on behalf of the United States. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Chmelar and 8 Mr. Proctor. 9 MR. CHMELAR: Good afternoon. 10 MR. KLEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 11 Klein, Marcia Hofmann, Daniel Stiller here for Mr. Hutchins, 12 who is here present in court out of custody. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Klein, 14 Ms. Hofmann, and Mr. Stiller. 15 And good afternoon to you, Mr. Hutchins. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. 17 THE COURT: We are here for an evidentiary hearing 18 on the defense motion to suppress. Before I begin, I see we 19 have some people in the audience. I want to make sure --20 and I'm now entering an order that all the witnesses are 21 sequestered, so the attorneys can make sure any of their 22 witnesses are not present in the courtroom before we begin. 23 MR. CHMELAR: Well, our two witnesses -- we only 24 have two -- they're in the hallway. 25 THE COURT: Any witnesses --

1 MR. KLEIN: And Mr. Hutchins might be our only 2 So he, of course, is allowed to be here. witness. 3 THE COURT: I understand. 4 All right. Is the Government ready to start? 5 I will address the two objections that I received. 6 But other than that, is the Government ready to start? 7 MR. CHMELAR: We are, Judge. 8 THE COURT: And, Mr. Klein, are you ready to 9 start? 10 MR. KLEIN: Yes, other than those two objections I 11 think you're going to get to. 12 THE COURT: Okay. As to the two objections, I 13 received objection from the defense objecting to the 14 admission of the Miranda warning statement with time 15 handwritten across it. 16 The Government had had an opportunity to respond. 17 I am overruling the objection and allowing it for the 18 following reasons: No. 1, as the parties very well know, 19 the Rule of Evidence does not apply at an evidentiary 20 hearing. 21 Secondly, the parties -- the defense who is moving 22 to exclude the statement, will have the opportunity, of 23 course, to cross-examine the witness and make any relevant

record and relevant argument regarding the Miranda

24

25

statement.

And then, lastly, and I think importantly, as I understand the defense motion here, the key question is voluntariness. So this is not a motion, as I understand it, on paper so far where the defense is alleging that Miranda warnings were not given at all. I think that would slightly change the analysis. But even then, what weight to give the statement and the circumstances regarding any handwriting or changes, it will all be part of the total analysis.

Mr. Klein, you look like you wish to be heard.

MR. KLEIN: When you're done, Your Honor, but I did want to respond to that last point.

THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead now before I move on to the second issue.

MR. KLEIN: So two points, Your Honor. We ask for exclusion but also an adverse inference just to make that clear.

Regarding your latter point, I think what's important to the analysis is that this written document was how Mr. Hutchins was allegedly advised of his rights. And so based on the disclosure we received from the Government, it was through an agent reading this form to him that he was advised and, through his signature on it, that he was advised of his rights, and, the Government argues effectively waived them knowing and voluntarily. So, therefore, I think it actually is directly on point in that

sense. And the timing of that, of course, would be incredibly relevant. I mean, if he had signed this form well after the fact, then it would not be a proper Miranda warning or waiver.

So with all due respect, I want to disagree with that part of your analysis, that the consequence we think is an appropriate consequence here where a piece of evidence has been altered after the fact.

I know the Government raises issue with, "Well, it's not been destroyed or lost," but our response is that the original document, contemporaneous with when they say he signed it, has been effectively destroyed or lost. So, therefore, those are appropriate remedies even at this early stage.

And I know the Government cited in its brief,
"Well, this usually happens at trial," and the cases it
relies on are civil cases. Civil cases, as Your Honor
knows, don't have suppression hearings. They have motions
in limine, and this is effectively a motion in limine. So
that's why we're saying this would be the appropriate time
to issue those rulings, as well as the reason I just
articulated the appropriate thing to do.

And I would note that, Your Honor, just as a related point, depending how the testimony comes out today and what the agents say about this process, we may need to

call the AUSAs as witnesses. I just want to flag that issue upfront potentially to impeach the FBI agents.

THE COURT: Mr. Chmelar or Proctor, do you wish to say anything?

It was my intention to get quickly through the objections so we can get to the motion, but since Mr. Klein made a record, I'll allow you to speak too. Is there anything you --

MR. CHMELAR: No. I think we state our position in our filing. We agree, obviously, with your decision on the issue. So, no, we don't have anything additional to say to that.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Klein, I'm going to take up your points in reverse order.

As to, I guess, the significance of the Miranda warning. Of course, that is relevant in the totality of the analysis. So I don't disagree with you there. But I was making the point that I would see it differently if the question was whether he was Mirandized at all.

But the parties will have -- you will have an opportunity, the Government will have an opportunity to ask questions of witnesses to layout as to the timing, as you point out, which, of course, is important. So I don't want to belabor that point.

The adverse inference, I think the Government is correct under Seventh Circuit law. Even in civil cases, to get an adverse inference, you have to show bad faith. So I want to set the adverse inference aside and frame this issue the way I see it. As to any inferences to be made regarding any of the evidence, including timing of the Miranda, including timing of reporting, whether reports are altered or changed in any way, those are the usual inferences that are part of any analysis in analyzing totality as to what weight to give any testimony, whether it's paper or whether it's oral testimony.

So although it's not an adverse inference finding in the sense I usually see in civil cases, but in doing a totality of analysis in deciding what weight to give evidence, I think I inherently get to decide which is more important, which is more valuable, which I can rely, which I can't rely on which move the needle or not move the needle toward the ultimate question being raised. So that's all I will say on that.

And I want to move to the second objection raised by the defense, that is as to the jail call post-interview of Mr. Hutchins.

The defense is absolutely correct. What is, I understand, the motion to be is what's at stake, or what's relevant or why the delving into is what happened in the

interview time both in terms of police action or also what Mr. Hutchins' state of mind or ability to knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waive his right. So the statement came after that.

And I read the transcript that the Government submitted, Exhibit 7. I believe it is numbered. So unless the statement, the audio call is illuminating the state of mind during the interview process, I don't see how it can help me analyze or move the needle on that.

Mr. Chmelar or Mr. Klein, did you wish to say anything further on that?

MR. CHMELAR: The Government would, Judge.

So are you affirmatively deciding that you will not consider it, and we should not introduce it, or you're not going to consider it as part of our arguments? Or are you keeping an open mind at this point?

THE COURT: Well, the way I came on the bench and was thinking about it, and I'm still thinking about this, is this: On paper, from reading it, I don't see it moving the needle; but, again, because the Rules of Evidence do not apply here, I will hear it. But I'm just telling you, right now you're going to have to persuade me how what happened after illuminates the state of mind of Mr. Hutchins during the relevant time, which is the interview.

MR. CHMELAR: And I think we're prepared to make

an argument on that at the conclusion. I know Your Honor had expressed interest in taking arguments at the conclusion of evidence of the hearing. So if you're still inclined to do that, we're prepared to argue how, from the Government's perspective, it is relevant in that it does indicate and go to several specific allegations that have been alleged by the defense.

I think, as you first indicated, if the defense had structured their argument in one particular way, maybe it wouldn't so irrelevant, but because they had argued coerciveness as part of their reason expressed post-arrest statement, we do think it goes to whether or not he was coerced during that statement and whether or not he was under the influence of whatever the allegation is.

So while it may have limitations based on the timing, we do think it still is relevant and does affect -- and will and able the Court to make a more informed decision about what had transpired during the interview.

THE COURT: Mr. Klein, did you wish to be heard?

MR. KLEIN: I mean, we just disagree on the points
they want to offer it in for. We think it is irrelevant for
those points. I think we made that clear.

Just not to try your patience, but just to go back to the bad faith thing real quick. We think we can show bad faith through things, but I just want to raise that issue

1 and let you know we understand the Government did raise the 2 bad faith issue, and we've now talked about it. 3 We do think, through various circumstantial 4 evidence, we can show bad faith to meet that standard. 5 THE COURT: Okay. So I will allow you to explore 6 that during the hearing. Again, that will go to any weight 7 to be given to any evidence that you wish me to consider. 8 What I do advise and remind counsel, again, why we 9 are here. This is not Mr. Hutchins' trial. We are here for 10 a very focused issue. So while I will indulge you, to a 11 certain extent, allow each side to make their record, but I 12 really need the parties to focus on what the legal questions 13 are as to this motion. Make your record, which will help me 14 in making a decision of this case. 15 With that, Mr. Chmelar, are you ready with your 16 first witness? 17 MR. CHMELAR: We are. We're going to first call 18 Special Agent Lee Chartier. 19 LEE CHARTIER, WITNESS, SWORN 20 THE CLERK: State your name and spell your last 21 name for the record. 22 THE WITNESS: My first name is Lee, L-E-E, 23 Chartier, C-H-A-R-T-I-E-R.

24

## 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. CHMELAR: 3 Agent Chartier, where do you work? 4 The FBI. 5 And what's your position with the FBI? 6 Special agent. Α 7 How long have you been employed with the FBI? 8 Eleven years, approximately. 9 Could you describe your background in the sense 10 of -- to the Court of what responsibilities as far as 11 assignments have been with the FBI? Like, what divisions or 12 sections? 13 When I first got on with the FBI, I spent three 14 years working counterterrorism. And then since, roughly, 15 2011, it's been cyber investigations. 16 And the entire time of your FBI career, have you 17 been assigned to the Milwaukee field office? 18 Α I have. 19 In addition to being a special agent, do you have 20 any other titles or responsibilities with the FBI in the 21 Milwaukee field office? 22 Yes, I do. Primarily supervisor. 23 What does that mean? It means when my boss is gone, I'm the person that 24 25 stands in.

1 So when the supervising special agent, that's the title of that individual, would be out of the office, you 2 3 would take over? 4 Correct. 5 And what are your responsibilities as they relate 6 to cyber investigations in the Milwaukee field office? 7 Α Investigate cyber-related crimes, cyber hacking, 8 cyber criminal intrusion typically financially motivated. 9 And are you a member of any kind of group or 10 section within the bureau that focuses in on that? 11 Yeah. We have a cyber crimes task force here in Α 12 Milwaukee that encompasses TFOs -- task force officers --13 from the local PDs, County, even other government agencies 14 like DHS, IRS. 15 During your history with the FBI, have you ever 16 received any commendations or awards? 17 Yes, I have. I received a Medal of Excellence Α from the director in 2016. 18 19 Would that be Director Comey? 20 Yes, it was. 21 What was the Medal of Excellence for? 22 Α Being a top performing cyber agent. 23 During your career as an FBI agent, have you ever 24 participated in any interviews? 25 Yes, I have.

1 Interviews of individuals in custody? 0 2 Α Yes. 3 And witnesses? 4 Correct. If you had to approximate, and it may be 5 6 difficult, but how many interviews of both witnesses and 7 in-custody individuals do you think you've participated in? 8 Yeah. I don't know entirely, but it's got to be 9 somewhere over 50. 10 What about if you had to break that down to just 11 the individuals who have been in custody? 12 Probably close to 20. 13 Are you one of the agents who was assigned to, in 14 part, to the investigation of Mr. Marcus Hutchins? 15 Yes, I was. 16 Would it be accurate to say it was for a limited 17 capacity? 18 Yes, that is correct. 19 Were you involved in his arrest in Las Vegas on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017? 20 21 Α I was. 22 I want to discuss some details around the events 23 of the arrest, leading up to the arrest, and then after the 24 arrest. 25 I've already mentioned the arrest took place in

1 Las Vegas, correct? 2 That is correct. He was arrested on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017. When did 3 4 you arrive in Las Vegas? 5 The day before. Α August 1st? 6 7 Correct. 8 Were you with anybody else? 9 Special Agent Jamie Butcher. 10 And who is she? 11 She's the case agent responsible for the Α investigation. 12 13 And what office is she associated with? 14 The Milwaukee office. The arrest that took place on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, 15 16 what specific location did the arrest -- where did it 17 happen? 18 At the Las Vegas airport. Any particular location in the -- well, let me 19 20 back up and rephrase that. 21 When you first observed Mr. Hutchins, where was 22 he? 23 He was in the terminal for the outbound international flights. 24 25 And did you observe where he went after he entered

1 the terminal? 2 Yes. He went into one of the lounges. 3 In the airport lounge? 4 Like, yeah, an airport lounge, first-class lounge. 5 Something to that. 6 Where they serve food and drinks and stuff like 0 7 that? 8 Α Correct. 9 At some point, did you approach him? 10 I did. Α 11 Were you with anybody? Yes. I was accompanied by two CBP officers, 12 13 uniformed CBP officers. 14 And when you approached Mr. Hutchins, was he alone 15 or was he with anybody? 16 He was alone at a table. 17 Can you describe to the Court the exchange that 18 you had with Mr. Hutchins at the airport lounge? 19 I just asked him if he was Marcus Hutchins. 20 identified as "yes." I asked him if he could come with us 21 to answer a few questions. 22 And did he agree? 0 23 Yes, he did. 24 Was he placed in handcuffs at that time? 0 25 No, he was not.

1 The lounge -- I know you described as, like, an 2 airport lounge. Is this, like, a public setting in the 3 terminal? 4 Correct. 5 Were there lots of other people around, or was it 6 pretty remote? 7 There was quite a few people around. 8 Okay. And when you approached him, could you 9 describe to the Court what you were wearing? 10 I was wearing business casual clothing. I didn't Α 11 have any identifying information out except for a badge that 12 the CBP officers had given me. 13 Okay. And were you armed? 14 I was. 15 Was your firearm visible? 16 No, it was not. 17 How was it concealed? 18 I just had the shirt over it. Α 19 You had your shirt untucked? 20 It was untucked and over the firearm. 21 Okay. What was Mr. Hutchins doing in the lounge 0 22 when you approached him? And by that I mean was he eating 23 or drinking anything? 24 Yeah. He was drinking a beverage. 25 At some point during your interactions with

1 Mr. Hutchins, were you able to clarify what he was drinking? 2 It came up that --Α Yes. 3 What did he identify the substance as? 4 He said he was drinking a soda. 5 After he agreed to go with you, where did you and 6 Mr. Hutchins and the CBP officers go? 7 We walked across the terminal to some locked Α 8 double doors. We went inside the double doors which had access to a stairwell that led down to where international 9 10 flights would come in for intake for, like, immigration 11 control areas. There were no flights inbound at that time, 12 so it was pretty desolate down there. 13 And what was the purpose of entering the 14 stairwell? 15 Just getting out of the sight of the public. 16 What happened once you were behind closed doors to 17 the staircase? 18 I identified myself. I told Mr. Hutchins that he 19 was under arrest pursuant to a federal arrest warrant. 20 And when you identified yourself, how did you do 21 that? What did you say? 22 I said I was a special agent with the FBI here to 23 serve an arrest warrant, and he was under arrest. 24 Did Mr. Hutchins ask you anything at that time? 25 He had a lot of questions. All I said to him at

1 that point was, "We're on our way to an interview room, if 2 you can just be patient." 3 All questions would be answered to him when he got 4 there. 5 And I think you said he was handcuffed? 6 Α He was handcuffed at that time, yes. 7 Was he handcuffed with his hands in front of him 8 or behind him? 9 Α Behind him. After he was handcuffed, where did you go? 10 11 We went to the CBP controlled space in there that 12 had an interview room in it. 13 With respect to -- like, in relation to where you 14 were in the stairwell, was that stairwell on the way to that 15 interview room? 16 It was. 17 And approximately how long did it take you to get 18 from the location where you placed the handcuffs on 19 Mr. Hutchins to the interview room? 20 A minute, maybe two. 21 Okay. And once you arrived at the interview room, 22 what did you do? 23 Completely -- again, identified myself. The other 24 agent that was with me, Special Agent Butcher, identified 25

herself. We, again, stated that we were here -- he was

1 under arrest pursuant to a federal arrest warrant. 2 You entered the room at that point, I assume, 3 correct? 4 Α Correct. 5 Can you describe to the Court what the room, the 6 makeup of the room was, the size, and what it consisted of? 7 Α It was an interview room, 10 x 10, roughly, a 8 table. It had two chairs in it originally. We added a 9 third. 10 Okay. And was Mr. Hutchins escorted to one 11 particular location of the interview room and seated? 12 Yes, he was. He was escorted to the other side of 13 the table with just one chair, and at that time he was 14 unhandcuffed. 15 The handcuffs were removed from him? 16 Correct. 17 Did he remain uncuffed while he was in the room 18 during the course of your time in that room? Yes, he did. 19 The interview room, did it have a door? 20 21 Obviously, correct? 22 Correct. 23 Did it have, like, not just an opening but an 24 actual physical door that would shut? 25 Α Yes.

Was the door locked or unlocked? 1 0 2 It was unlocked. We could come and go. Α 3 What about a bathroom? He had access to a bathroom. We asked him a 4 5 couple times if he needed to. I think he only took us up 6 one time. 7 So you've described the initial interactions with 8 Mr. Hutchins. You identified yourself. Do you have some 9 sort of credentials that you used to do that? 10 Yes, I do. Α 11 And who are those issued by? The FBI. 12 13 Do you usually use those to conduct interviews in 14 the course of identifying yourself to people who are being 15 interviewed? 16 I always do that just to make sure they 17 understand who they're talking to. 18 You mentioned when you got to the room that Agent 19 Butcher was there? 20 Yes, she was. 21 Was there anybody else in the interview room at that time? 22 23 Α No. Did anybody else participate in the interview of 24 25 Mr. Hutchins other than you and Agent Butcher?

A No.

Q You indicated earlier in your testimony that you have experience interviewing approximately 50 individuals, some in custody, out of custody, and approximately 20 -- participating in approximately 20 in-custody interviews.

Do you have a particular pattern you follow when you conduct in-custody interviews?

A Yes. Always start out with identifying yourself, explaining the reason why the individual is there, and then explaining the Advice of Rights form. I typically always read that verbatim. I hand that form to them, ask them to read it, even read portions of it out loud. I typically always ask them if they can read English; and if they agree with what's written on that form, please sign below.

Q And, generally, as you describe it, did you do that at this particular case interviewing Mr. Hutchins?

A Absolutely.

MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I should've asked before we started. I have approximately four exhibits that I intend to show Agent Chartier. I know that Mr. Proctor has a number of exhibits he intends to show Agent Butcher.

Do you want us to ask permission each time we approach, or could we just approach?

THE COURT: You may approach. And that goes to both of you. Please, just approach.

1 MR. CHMELAR: Thank you. 2 And I provided copies of all four exhibits. 3 going to show Agent Chartier and to the defense. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 BY MR. CHMELAR: 6 Agent Chartier, I handed you what's marked Exhibit 7 9. Do you recognize that? 8 Yes, I do. 9 How do you recognize it? 10 Α This is the form that Mr. Hutchins was presented 11 with that day of the interview. There's two witness lines at the bottom of the 12 13 form, near the bottom of the form. Do you see those? 14 Yes, I do. Α 15 There's two signatures there. Do you recognize 16 one of those signatures as being yours? 17 Yes. Mine is the messier one. Is it the one in the blue ink? 18 19 Yes, it is. 20 You indicated earlier, at least you described 21 earlier kind of the sequence you go through when you're 22 interviewing in-custody individuals. 23 With respect to Exhibit 9, how did you use Exhibit 9 during the interview with Mr. Hutchins? 24 25 I used it like I always do. I had the form in my

1 I read it out loud and then presented it to him hand. 2 across the table. I asked him if he could read the form. Ι 3 asked him if he could understand and read English. 4 then, if he even wanted to, to read parts of it out loud and 5 then sign if he agreed below. 6 After you did that, did Mr. Hutchins read the 7 form? 8 He looked at it. My understanding is he read it. 9 Did he sign it? 10 Yes, he did. Α 11 Do you recognize his signature on this form? 12 Yes. It's right here (indicating). 13 Under the section marked "Consent"? 14 Correct. 15 After Mr. Hutchins signed the form, did you sign 16 the form? 17 Yes, I did. Α 18 And where was Agent Butcher during this process? She was on the same side of the table as I was. 19 20 signed it and then handed it to her. 21 And then what happened to the form? 22 She signed it, and then it went in the folder. 23 Did Mr. Hutchins indicate that he understood what was stated on the form and what you had read to him? 24 25 He indicated he did. He continued to talk to us.

1 Did he ask you any questions about anything that 2 was contained on the form? 3 Α No. 4 MR. CHMELAR: Judge, we'd ask that Exhibit 9 be 5 admitted. 6 MR. STILLER: No objection, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Exhibit 9 is received. 8 MR. CHMELAR: Thank you, Judge. 9 BY MR. CHMELAR: 10 Agent, I've handed you what we marked as Exhibit 11 Do you recognize Exhibit 8? 12 I do. 13 What is it? 14 Just an acknowledgment that any violation or attempt to lie to us is a violation of the 1001. 15 16 Title 18, Section 1001? 17 Correct. 18 And did you use this form during the interview 19 with Mr. Hutchins? 20 Yes, we did. 21 How did you use it? 22 Again, just reaffirming that, you know, in talking 23 to us, that he needs to be truthful. Anything that he says isn't truthful is a violation of this. 24 25 O Okay. With the Advice of Rights form, you

1 described the process in which you read from the form to 2 him, Mr. Hutchins, and then you handed him the form and then 3 had him read it. Did you do that with respect to the 4 acknowledgment of penalties for false statements to the FBI? 5 I think I just paraphrased it; just that, "You 6 understand it's illegal to lie to us. Please read this form 7 as well and sign it if you agree." 8 Okay. And looking at Exhibit 8, do you recognize 9 your signature on Exhibit 8? 10 I do. Α 11 Where does it appear on Exhibit 8? It's, again, in blue ink right below 12 13 Agent Butcher's. 14 And then do you recognize Mr. Hutchins' signature 15 on the form? 16 T do. 17 And where does that appear? 0 18 It's right there under the signed category. 19 With respect to Exhibit 9 and Exhibit 8, did you 20 actually witness Mr. Hutchins sign both of those forms? 21 I did. Α 22 MR. CHMELAR: Judge, we would ask Exhibit 8 be 23 admitted into evidence. 24 MR. STILLER: No objection. 25 THE COURT: Exhibit 8 is received.

#### BY MR. CHMELAR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Agent Chartier, after you identified yourself and advised Mr. Hutchins of his rights as described on the Advice of Rights form, Exhibit 9, and advised him of his acknowledgment of penalties for false statements to the FBI shown on Exhibit 8, did you conduct an interview with him?
  - A I did.
- Q I've handed you Government Exhibit 1. Do you recognize Government Exhibit 1?
  - A Yes, I do.
  - Q How do you recognize it?
  - A It's a recording of the interview.
- Q There's a set of initials on Government Exhibit 1.

  Do you recognize the initials, or at least one of the initials on there?
  - A Yes, I do.
  - Q Whose initials do you recognize those to be?
- 18 A It's mine.
  - Q Prior to appearing in court today, did you listen to the contents of Government Exhibit 1?
    - A Yes, I did.
    - Q And after listening to it, did you then mark your initials on it as a form of identifying it?
      - A I mean, at the time this was made?
- 25 Q Yeah.

1 Α Yes. Okay. To the best of your knowledge, does it 2 3 truly and accurately reflect the contents of the interview 4 you conducted, the recorded interview you conducted with Mr. Hutchins on August 2<sup>nd</sup>? 5 6 Α Yes, it does. 7 MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I would ask Exhibit 1 be 8 admitted into evidence. 9 MR. STILLER: No objection. 10 THE COURT: Exhibit 1 is received. 11 MR. CHMELAR: Thank you, Judge. BY MR. CHMELAR: 12 13 You already indicated that the individuals present 14 for the interview were you, Agent Butcher, and Mr. Hutchins. 15 Are those the speakers that could be heard on the recording 16 on Exhibit 1? 17 I think at one point, another agent came in 18 regarding the consent for the phone that you can hear on the 19 recording, but the primary two were me and Special Agent 20 Butcher. 21 And when you say "consent for the phone," what are 22 you referring to? 23 At one point, it was requested for Mr. Hutchins to

provide consent to search a backpack, I think two phones and

24

25

a laptop.

1 0 And did he agree to that? 2 He did. Α 3 I've handed you what's been marked as Exhibit 4. 4 Do you recognize that? 5 Α Yes, I do. 6 What do you recognize it to be? 7 Α Consent to search. 8 Is that the consent to search that you were 9 referring to just a moment ago in your testimony? 10 Yes, it was. Α 11 There's a number of things listed on the consent 12 form. It's two phones, two laptops, a backpack, and then a 13 USB identified by make and color, correct? 14 Α Correct. 15 Do you recognize the signature at the bottom 16 under -- on Exhibit 4, under the No. 4 it says, "I authorize 17 these agents to take the items which they may determine to 18 be related to their investigation." 19 Then there's a date and signature. 20 I do. 21 Okay. The signature above that, do you 0 22 recognize -- or I'm sorry -- the signature right below that 23 above the signature for Jamie Butcher, do you recognize that 24 signature? 25 Which signature are you talking about?

1 0 The one above Agent Butcher's. 2 Yes, I do. Α 3 Whose signature is that? 4 Mr. Hutchins. 5 And did you witness Mr. Hutchins sign this form? 6 Α I did. 7 And that happened during the course of the 8 interview after he was advised of his rights and the 9 acknowledgment of penalties for perjury or, excuse me, 10 penalties for false statements to the FBI? 11 It was. Α And since we're on the topic, I'm going to ask you 12 13 about that -- you know, stay on the phones and the consent 14 to search right now. Were any of these devices locked? 15 Α Yes. 16 And how were they unlocked? 17 Key code, thumbprint. By who? 18 Q 19 Mr. Hutchins. He did that at your request, or he volunteered to 20 0 21 do that? 22 He volunteered to do that. 23 Do you remember during the course of the 24 interview, specifically related to the phones, anything 25 remarkable or anything specific about how they were unlocked

1 or jokes or anything related to him unlocking those two 2 devices? 3 Yeah. One of the devices he commented the Α 4 password was long enough that we wouldn't be able to guess 5 it, and he couldn't unlock himself when he was intoxicated, 6 which was a good thing. 7 And was he successful in unlocking it at that 8 time? 9 Yes, he was. 10 What about the other device? Did he make a joke 11 about the password for that? 12 Yeah. He said we could probably guess it. It was 13 something very simple. I don't remember exactly what it 14 was. 15 Okay. But that's captured on the audio recording 16 in Exhibit 1, correct? 17 It is. Α 18 Both of those things you just described; is that 19 correct? 20 Α Correct. 21 MR. CHMELAR: And, Judge, we would ask to admit 22 Exhibit 4. 23 MR. STILLER: No objection. THE COURT: Exhibit 4 is received. 24 25 ///

BY MR. CHMELAR:

Q Agent, you just described at least a part of the interview with Mr. Hutchins that occurred after you went over the Advice of Rights and things like that with him.

Other than, you know, kind of like the jokes about the password and other casual conversations about the password to the phone, how would you describe the nature of the interview and the exchange with Mr. Hutchins during the interview process?

- A Professional. Friendly at times.
- Q And what was the format? What I mean by that was it a Q and A? Was it more of a dialogue or a mix?
- A It was a little bit of a mix, but a lot of Q and A.
- Q And during the interview, did you ever find Mr. Hutchins to be evasive?
  - A At times.
- Q And in response to Mr. Hutchins being evasive, what did you do?
- A You can hear me a couple times just kind of quasi admonish him that we know more details than we're telling him, and it's important that he's truthful with us.
- Q And prior to the beginning of the interview, or during the interview, did he ever express any reservations about talking to you?

1 No, he didn't. 2 Prior to the start of the interview or during the 3 interview, did he ever say that he wanted to have an 4 attorney present? 5 No, he did not. 6 Other than being somewhat, you know, joking at 7 times and being evasive at other times, how would you 8 describe his overall level of mental awareness during the 9 interview? 10 It was good. I didn't see anything that would 11 indicate otherwise. 12 Did you have any indication during the interview, 13 either during a reading of his rights or any time during the 14 course of the interview, that he was under the influence of 15 either drugs or alcohol or impaired in any way? 16 No, I did not. 17 At any point, did you observe any physical manifestations of impairment or intoxication? 18 19 Α No. 20 Was he sweating at all, complaining of nausea or 21 vomiting? 22 Α No. 23 Was he fidgety? A little bit but none that I would constitute as 24 what I would typically see in somebody that's intoxicated.

1 Did he seem mentally aware of what was going on 2 and engaged in the interview with you? 3 Α Yes. 4 Did he do anything that led you to believe that? 5 Was he asking any questions or asking clarifying questions 6 about the nature of what you were asking him? 7 Α Several clarifying questions, yes. 8 The entire interview and the exchange you had with 9 him, it was all in English, correct? 10 Α Correct. 11 Was he shown any documents during the interview? 12 Yes, he was. 13 What was he shown? 14 He was shown a sheet of online identities that we Α 15 knew he had knowledge of or used himself. 16 And approximately how many? 17 I think, roughly, like, 80. And what else? 18 19 Then he was shown another sheet that had some 20 string information related to a program in it. 21 What do you mean a "string information"? 0 22 Just, like, a different way of looking at a file. Α 23 Computer code or a computer file? Q 24 Α Yes. 25 MR. STILLER: Which?

1 Compound question. Singular answer. 2 THE COURT: Sustained. 3 BY MR. CHMELAR: 4 Was it a computer code? A way of looking at a 5 computer code? 6 Α Correct. 7 What else? Anything? 8 The last one would be a chat, a page of chat 9 between two people. 10 And what was the nature of the chat? Like, what 11 was the chat? It was a dialogue between an instant messaging ID 12 13 that Mr. Hutchins said was him and another individual. 14 Okay. What was the purpose of giving him the Q 15 approximately 80 nicknames? We knew he had information on several of them, and 16 17 we knew he used some of them. So it was in an effort to try 18 to help jog his memory to provide us further information. 19 MR. STILLER: Your Honor, I'm going to object. 20 THE COURT: There's an objection? 21 I'm not seeing the relevance of this MR. STILLER: to the voluntariness of the decision whether to talk or not 22 23 talk. THE COURT: Mr. Chmelar, relevance? 24 25 MR. CHMELAR: The relevance is that they've

1 claimed that he was intoxicated of some sort, or on drugs, 2 and, therefore, he was not capable of validly waiving his 3 Miranda rights. 4 They've additionally alleged that he was coerced 5 into making a post-arrest statement. 6 The fact that he was able to review approximately 80 nicknames from a list with recall suggests that he was 7 not under the influence, intoxicated. He was mentally 8 9 competent to proceed in the interview. 10 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. 11 MR. CHMELAR: Thank you, Judge. BY MR. CHMELAR: 12 13 What was his response to reviewing the 80 14 nicknames? 15 He remembered several; identified roughly a handful of his own. 16 17 Okay. Did he provide you context with some of the 18 names? 19 Yes, he did. 20 And the only thing listed on the sheet were 21 nicknames? 22 Correct. 23 What about the string, this computer code or 24 string that you referred to, what was the point of that? It was an effort to try to get him to identify a 25

1 specific piece of software that we thought he had knowledge 2 of. 3 0 What software? 4 It's a Kronos malware. 5 Okay. And did he review it? 6 Α He did. 7 And what did he identify it as? 8 He said, "I don't know what to tell you. 9 string." 10 And did you understand what he meant by that? 11 I did. He's looking, I mean --12 How did you interpret that? What did you 13 interpret that to mean? 14 He didn't recognize the string itself. He did key 15 in on one word that was in the string, and it said "Kronos." 16 Okay. Is a string -- in your experience, is it 17 different than source code or other compiled computer code? It is. 18 Α Is it more difficult or easier to read than a 19 20 search code? 21 It's easier to read but less informative. 22 Okay. But he was able to review it? 0 23 He was able to review it. And he was able to form an opinion about it as the 24 25 way it was?

1 Α Correct. 2 And as best you can, for people who are unfamiliar 3 with a string the way that you're describing, what does it 4 look like? Just alpha numeric characters, or what is it? 5 It looks like a long string of characters. Yeah. 6 And then you also described providing him with a 7 set of chats, correct? 8 Correct. 9 I've handed you Exhibit 11. Do you recognize 10 Exhibit 11? 11 Yes, I do. Α 12 Is this part of the chats that Mr. Hutchins 13 reviewed? 14 Yes, it was. Α Do you see a date on the -- well, let me back up. 15 16 Going from left to right on Exhibit 11. 17 column all the way to the left, what is represented in that column? 18 19 Those are those online instant messaging IDs we 20 talked about earlier. 21 And did Mr. Hutchins identify one of these as 22 being him? 23 Yes, he did. Which one? 24 0 25 My understanding was IRP@Jabber.sd.

1 And the next column over, is that a date? 0 2 Yes, it is. Α 3 And what is the date of this particular chat? It's February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015. 4 5 Am I correct in saying that attached to that 6 string is a time? 7 Α Correct. 8 And then to the far right, there's the actual text 9 of the chat? 10 Α Correct. 11 When you presented him with this particular page, did he review it? 12 13 He did review it. Α 14 Was he able to recall it? 15 Yes, he was. And this interview took place in 2017, but he was 16 17 able to recall chats from 2015, correct? 18 Yes, he was. Α 19 And, specifically, was he able to -- there's some 20 highlighted parts on this, correct? 21 Α Correct. 22 All the way at the top, there's something related 23 to Sunspace? 24 Α Uh-huh. 25 Do you know what Sunspace is?

1 It's a file sharing website that, you know, Yeah. 2 you can post a file out there, make it available to others, 3 and then they can download the file and then delete the 4 link. 5 And was he able to identify what his interactions 6 were with respect to this particular page and in relation to 7 the other individual he's chatting with? 8 Yes, he was. 9 What did he tell you? 10 He compiled Kronos for this individual and then 11 made it available via Sunspace. 12 MR. CHMELAR: Okay. Judge, I would ask Exhibit 11 13 be admitted. 14 MR. STILLER: No objection. 15 THE COURT: 11 is received. 16 BY MR. CHMELAR: 17 You mentioned that when Mr. Hutchins entered the 18 interview room, there was, like, a bottle of water waiting 19 for him, right? 20 There was a bottle of water waiting for him Yeah. 21 in the interview room. 22 Did you at some point offer him food? 0 23 Yes, we did. 24 O Did he, in fact, eat? 25 Α Yes, he did.

A It was, like, a fast food burger place. I don't recall the name.  Q Did you give him the opportunity to ask you questions?  A Yes, a couple.  Q Did one of the requests relate to the fact that I wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?  A He was given access to his phone, and my	
Q Did you give him the opportunity to ask you questions?  A Yes, a couple.  Did one of the requests relate to the fact that I wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  A Somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  A Yes, we did.  A Yes, we did.  Did you give him the opportunity to ask you guestions?	
questions?  A Yes, a couple.  Q Did one of the requests relate to the fact that I wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
A Yes, a couple.  Q Did one of the requests relate to the fact that I wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
Q Did one of the requests relate to the fact that 1 wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
wasn't going to be making his flight?  A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
A It did.  Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
Q And what was the request?  A He asked if he could contact his mother so she didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
A He asked if he could contact his mother so she  didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to  an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
didn't have to drive, I think roughly, like, four hours to an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
an airport that he wasn't going to be arriving at.  Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  Q How did that happen?	
Q It's somewhere in the UK?  A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  How did that happen?	
15 A Somewhere in the UK, correct.  16 Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  17 A Yes, we did.  18 Q How did that happen?	
Q Okay. And did you allow him to do that?  A Yes, we did.  How did that happen?	
17 A Yes, we did. 18 Q How did that happen?	
Q How did that happen?	
10 No was given aggods to his phone and my	
A He was given access to his phone, and my	
understanding, he was allowed to contact her via Facebook.	
Q At any point during the interview, did you notice	
that he was slurring his speech at all?	
23 A No.	
MR. CHMELAR: May I have one moment, Judge?	
THE COURT: You may.	

1 BY MR. CHMELAR: 2 Was there anything during the interview concerning 3 his physical appearance that gave you concern? 4 No. 5 I want to go back to a follow-up question about 6 when you first had contacted with him at the lounge. You 7 referenced that he was drinking, like, a Coke or something 8 like that. Some sort of soda. 9 Did you ask him if he had been consuming any 10 alcohol prior to the interview? 11 Yes, we did. And he said, "No, I don't typically 12 drink alcohol before flights because it makes me 13 dehydrated." 14 Did you ask him anything else? 15 Other than if he had drank that day, and he said, 16 "No," he wasn't drinking. 17 Anything related to his state of mind? 18 I asked him if he was of the right frame of Α Yeah. 19 mind to have a conversation with us, and he said he was. 20 MR. CHMELAR: Give me one more minute, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: You may. 22 MR. CHMELAR: Thank you. 23 We don't have any other questions on direct, 24 Judge. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Stiller, am I looking at you?

1 MR. STILLER: You are, Your Honor. 2 May I question from the podium? 3 THE COURT: Yes, you may. Just be careful to 4 project, if that's your preference, Mr. Stiller, so that not 5 only the court reporter can hear you but also we're using 6 the recording as well. 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. STILLER: Agent Chartier, back on August 2<sup>nd</sup> of last year, 9 10 am I correct that that's the first exposure you've ever had 11 to Marcus Hutchins? 12 One on one? 13 Had you ever met him before? 14 Α No. 15 Had you ever talked to him before? 16 No. Had you ever seen him, been around him? 17 18 I had seen him at the airport before but never 19 been around him. 20 You had seen him at what airport when? 21 I had seen him at the international airport in 22 Las Vegas. On August 2<sup>nd</sup>? 23 24 On August 2. All right. So August 2<sup>nd</sup> of 2017 represents 25

1 the -- as of that moment, the universe of exposure you had 2 to Marcus Hutchins, right? 3 Α Correct. 4 And so when you've generally testified to your 5 sense of him during the interview with him, you have no 6 basis for comparison, right? 7 That would be correct. 8 You saw what you saw, but you're not in a position 9 to say that, "Oh, I know what Hutchins looks like when he 10 has his A game, and this was his A game." 11 Right? 12 Okay. 13 Is that correct? 14 That was the first time I saw him, yes. 15 All right. And you have no basis for comparing 16 his behavior any other time with the time you were with him 17 on August 2<sup>nd</sup>? 18 Sure. 19 All right. Real quick, I want to draw your 20 attention to Exhibit 1, which is the audio recording of 21 Mr. Hutchins' post-arrest statement. 22 Α Okay. 23 Correct? 24 Α Correct. 25 Q All right. And Mr. Chmelar asked you whether that

1 constitutes an accurate depiction of the interview, right? 2 He did. Α 3 And you said that it is accurate? 4 Yes. 5 But the reality is it is not complete, right? 6 Listening to the interview, yes, it wasn't started Α 7 at the very beginning of the discussion in that room. 8 And that would mean it is not complete, right? 9 Well, I mean, it depends on what your definition 10 of when the interview actually started. I mean, if I'm just 11 filling out forms, I don't necessarily constitute that as 12 part of the interview. 13 We'll get there in a second. 14 Α Okay. 15 But just so we're clear, to the extent this judge 16 listens to that recording, isn't it true that it will begin 17 mid-stream? Not mid-statement but mid-stream? 18 I don't think that's an accurate depiction. 19 was still filling out forms at the time the audio recording 20 was turned on. 21 The evidence will speak for itself. 22 But the key component here is that you've 23 testified today about this Advisement of Rights, right? 24 Α Uh-huh. 25 You've testified today about reading those rights

1 to Mr. Hutchins, right? 2 I did. Α 3 You've testified today about an exchange of forms, 4 right? 5 Α Okay. 6 Not "okay." Is that "yes" or "no"? 7 Α Yes. 8 All right. And the bottom line is that that 9 recording that is Exhibit 1, none of what you've testified 10 to in that regard will appear on the audio recording, right? 11 Not all of the forms, no. Some of the forms are Α 12 on the recording. 13 The Advisement of Rights with regard to the right 14 to remain silent and the right to an attorney? 15 I said some of the forms, not all of them. 16 consent forms were filled out on the recording. 17 I'll ask the question more precisely. 18 The advisement to Mr. Hutchins of his right to 19 remain silent and of his right to have an attorney and an 20 attorney present, that portion of the conversation is not 21 depicted on the audio, correct? 22 No, that's not on the audio recording. 23 All right. Mr. Chmelar sort of started with the 24 actual arrest, or your initial contact with Mr. Hutchins in 25 the airport lounge, right?

1	1 A Right.		
2	2 Q That's where Mr. Chme.	lar started his questioning?	
3	3 A Okay. Yes.		
4	Q And I think you testi:	fied that you were there with	
5	two customs and border patrol agents, right?		
6	6 A I was.		
7	7 Q And they were in uniform	orm?	
8	8 A That's correct.		
9	9 Q For the Court's benefi	it, could you describe what a	
10	CBP uniform that day looked like?		
11	11 A As I recall, it was na	avy blue with a badge. The	
12	title of "CBP" spelled out; weapons visible, a duty belt.		
13	That's all, roughly, I recall.		
14	Q And, in contrast, you	were business casual, right?	
15	15 A Correct.		
16	16 Q But you made mention o	of the fact that you had a	
17	17 law enforcement credential, corr	law enforcement credential, correct?	
18	18 A I did.		
19	19 Q And that was some kind	d of credential that had been	
20	20 loaned to you by CBP?	loaned to you by CBP?	
21	21 A I had a visitor badge	that allowed me to enter and	
22	exit the terminal while still remaining armed.		
23	Q Okay. I assume that o	didn't identify you as an FBI	
24	agent?		
25	25 A It did not.		

1 Did it in any way include reference to CBP? 2 It had reference to law enforcement. I don't 3 remember if it had reference to CBP. 4 So if Mr. Hutchins or anyone else sitting in that 5 bar would've seen you three individuals, that person 6 would've seen a business casual individual and two fully 7 garmented CBP officers, right? 8 Correct. 9 I think you indicated that upon approaching 10 Mr. Hutchins, your first remark was that you asked him to 11 come with you. You had some questions for him, right? 12 Correct. 13 And I'm not questioning the truthfulness of you 14 having questions for him, but what was really going on here 15 is that you had an arrest warrant that you were there to 16 execute, right? 17 Correct. 18 But on that initial contact, that detail was 19 omitted in favor of "We would like to ask you some 20 questions, "right? 21 Yeah, in the effort of trying to present the least 22 intrusive way to interact with Mr. Hutchins. 23 And in going least intrusive, the fact that -- the 24 arrest warrant was withheld at that initial moment, right? 25 Just for a couple seconds to walk across the

1 terminal, yes, it was. 2 At that moment? 3 At that moment, it was. 4 All right. And so then you and the border 5 patrol -- or the CBP agents escort Mr. Hutchins to some kind 6 of stairwell, right? 7 Α Correct. 8 And backing up a second. Your activities in 9 connection with this situation were being monitored by other 10 officers, right? Officers or agents? 11 I'm not sure what you're asking. 12 There was surveillance going on, right? 13 Yes, there was. 14 And agents other than you, they ultimately 15 maintained what they captioned a "Surveillance Log," right? 16 Yes. 17 And that surveillance log noted Mr. Hutchins' 18 arrival to the airport, correct? 19 I would have to read it, but I assume so. 20 Would you like to see it to refresh your memory? Q 21 I haven't seen it, so, yeah. Sure. Α 22 If you could just browse that to yourself. Q 23 Α Okay. 24 So having had an opportunity to review that, other 25 agents noted the time of Mr. Hutchins' arrival to the

```
1
       airport itself, right?
 2
            Α
                 Yeah.
 3
                 Noted the time he approached the ticket counter,
            Q
 4
       right?
 5
            Α
                 Yeah.
 6
                 The time he passed through security?
 7
                 Yeah.
            Α
 8
                 And ultimately his presence in the lounge, right?
 9
            Α
                 Correct.
10
                 And it indicates that your escort of Mr. Hutchins
11
       out of the lounge occurred at 1:17 p.m.?
                 I didn't look at the specific time on there.
12
13
                 Would it refresh your memory to look at it again?
14
            Α
                 Sure.
15
                 MR. CHMELAR: We'll stipulate, Judge, that if it
16
       says it in the report, that's what time it happened.
17
                 MR. STILLER: No rush.
18
                 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah, 1:17.
19
                 MR. STILLER:
                               Thank you.
20
       BY MR. STILLER:
21
                 So then in the stairwell, you're still there in
22
       your business casual, right?
23
                 Correct.
                 Are the CBP uniformed folks there with you?
24
25
                 Yeah. Everything was locked. I couldn't get
```

1 anywhere without them. 2 So they were there with you? 3 Α Correct. 4 All right. And it's at that point where handcuffs 5 are placed on Mr. Hutchins, right? 6 Α Correct. 7 And you testified today that Mr. Hutchins had a 8 bunch of questions, right? 9 Yeah, of course. He had several questions. 10 And one of those questions would've been, "What is 11 this about?" 12 Right? 13 Well, I don't recall exactly what he was asking, 14 but I assume that was one of them. 15 Well, you've encountered a man in a lounge and 16 told him you have a few questions, right? 17 Uh-huh. Α 18 That happened, correct? Q 19 Correct. 20 And then you escort him to a stairwell, right? O 21 Uh-huh. Α 22 And at that point, you placed handcuffs on him, Q 23 right? I did. 24 Α 25 0 And so it almost would just make sense that

1 someone might ask, among other questions, "What is this 2 about?" 3 Right? 4 It makes sense. 5 All right. And I think you even testified on 6 direct that you shared with Mr. Hutchins that what this is 7 about is something that would be shared later in the 8 interview room, right? 9 I told him he was under arrest pursuant to a 10 federal arrest warrant and that further details would be 11 explained to him shortly if he could just be patient. 12 And I quess the question I have is that today you 13 testified that at that point you told Mr. Hutchins that he's 14 under arrest pursuant to a federal arrest warrant. That's 15 your testimony today, right? 16 Yes, it is. 17 All right. But mid last April, you met with 18 Mr. Chmelar and/or Mr. Proctor, correct? 19 Last April? 20 Middle of this April. Last month. 21 Okay. This last -- yes. 22 0 And I'm going to guess that you were in the loop 23 knowing that that was the day before we were scheduled to have this very hearing, right? 24 25 Correct.

And whether it was Mr. Chmelar or Mr. Proctor, an 1 2 assistant U.S. attorney sort of reviewed the events of that 3 day in anticipation of your testimony the following day, 4 right? 5 Α They did. 6 And isn't it true that, at that time, what you 7 shared with the prosecutors is that you, in handcuffing 8 Mr. Hutchins, you told him that he was under arrest, period? 9 I didn't testify to that. 10 I don't understand what your question is. 11 I'm not talking about testimony. 12 When you were meeting with Mr. Chmelar and/or 13 Mr. Proctor in anticipation of testifying the following day, 14 isn't it true that you discussed that portion of your 15 dialogue with Mr. Hutchins in terms of telling him simply 16 that he was under arrest? 17 We talked about the arrest and how it 18 happened. I'm not sure what the question is. 19 In talking with Mr. Chmelar and/or Mr. Proctor, 20 did you discuss the dialogue between yourself and Mr. Hutchins in the stairwell last August 2nd? 21 22 Yes, I did. Α 23 And in discussing that dialogue with Mr. Chmelar 24 or Mr. Proctor on that day, isn't it true that what you

shared is that you advised Mr. Hutchins that he was under

25

1 arrest without reference to an arrest warrant? 2 I advised him that he was under arrest, yes, but I 3 would tell him why I was there and the law enforcement 4 purpose that I'm serving. 5 I'm not sure what your question is. 6 My question is: In speaking with the prosecutors 7 in anticipation of testifying last month --8 MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I would object to the 9 continued, repeated questioning of the same question 10 answered over again. 11 Agent Chartier has stated what his recollection is 12 about both the arrest and his conversation in preparing for 13 testimony. 14 I don't know if Mr. Stiller is proposing that same 15 questioning, presenting the same question another time is 16 going to provide any more clarity. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Stiller, I'll ask that you please 18 move on from this question. 19 MR. STILLER: Thank you. 20 BY MR. STILLER: 21 So at some point, if I heard you right, you escorted now handcuffed Mr. Hutchins down some stairs or 22 23 something like that to an interview room? 24 Yeah. 25 And Agent Butcher was waiting there for you in

that interview room?

A She was.

Q And we tal

Q And we talked in terms of initially there were two chairs but a third one was necessary?

A Correct.

Q Is that third chair something that had to be obtained and moved into the room after you and Mr. Hutchins arrived to the room?

A No. We thought about it beforehand, and it was brought in before.

Q So the third chair was waiting for you by the time you got there?

A Correct.

Q Now, going back to the stairwell real quick.

Backtracking for just a second. When Mr. Hutchins asked words to the effect of, "What is this about," and your answer was either that he's under arrest or under arrest pursuant to an arrest warrant, there was no mention made that the arrest warrant was out of the Eastern District of Wisconsin, correct?

A At that time, no.

Q There was no mention that the arrest warrant flowed from an indictment, correct?

A I don't believe I mentioned that at that time.

Q And if you didn't mention there was an indictment,

I'm guessing that there was no mention that the indictment contained multiple felony charges naming Mr. Hutchins and another with a variety of Kronos-related crimes, correct?

MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I guess I would object to the line of questioning at this point because I'm not sure how it relates to -- or the multiple arguments presented in the motion to suppress related to the waiver of Miranda in the coerciveness of the interviewing tactics by the agents.

THE COURT: Mr. Stiller?

MR. STILLER: Your Honor, what Mr. Hutchins did and didn't know at the time that he was Advised of Rights, may have waived rights, and then proceeded to talk and continue to talk I think is relevant to the knowing and informed and voluntary nature of his decision to talk in terms of what he shared.

THE COURT: I'll allow it. You may proceed.

MR. CHMELAR: Can I just make one other point,

Judge?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. CHMELAR: It wasn't the basis of their motion.

Their motion was that it was a citizen of the United

Kingdom, that he was sleep deprived, that he was intoxicated

as far as the waiver of Miranda.

Those factors, in their motion they argued, related to the fact that the agents' tactics were then

coercive.

They've never alleged, as far as I know, until this most recent filing in the memoranda in support of their position, that there's somehow some sort of deceptive practices.

So I don't think it's on point, but I respect
Your Honor's decision. I just wanted to clarify for the
record why we're making that objection.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Because I'm looking at voluntariness, and a lot of factors can go into it, I'll allow it.

Mr. Stiller, you may continue, please.

MR. CHMELAR: Thank you, Judge.

MR. STILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## BY MR. STILLER:

Q So in the interview room with you and Agent Butcher, fairly quickly Mr. Hutchins again asked what this is about, correct?

A I don't recall exactly when he asked, but it was explained to him as much as we could at that time.

Q Well, let's back up.

When we're in the stairwell, he had questions, and you said, basically in so many words, "We'll get to that later in the interview room," right?

A Yeah. I asked him to be patient, and further

1 information would be explained to him. 2 And then now we're in the interview room. 3 joined by Agent Butcher. And at some point fairly early in 4 things, Mr. Hutchins again asked what this is about, right? 5 I'm sure he did. 6 And when you say you're sure you did, do you 7 remember that at that point, Agent Butcher said, "We're 8 going to get to that." Right? 9 You would have to ask Agent Butcher. 10 Or listen to the recording? 0 11 Or listen to the recording. Α 12 Very well. 13 Then an interview followed, and it lasted, in 14 total, about 90 minutes, right? Yeah. An hour 45, roughly. 15 Α 16 Okay. And it covered many topics like 17 Mr. Hutchins' personal background, right? 18 Α Correct. 19 To some extent, his education and his job history, 20 right? 21 Correct. Α 22 Discussed his online activities including gaming? 0 23 Yeah, I do remember that. His coding activities? 24 Q 25 Α Yes.

1 Kronos was discussed? 0 2 Yes, it was. Α 3 There was the issue of access to Mr. Hutchins' Q 4 backpack, his laptop, and his phone, right? 5 Yeah, regarding consent. 6 Some conversation about his recent 7 activities in Las Vegas, right? 8 Α Yes. 9 0 He was there for a conference? 10 Α Yes. 11 Talk of black hats? Yeah. I remember Jamie had some line of 12 13 questioning regarding that. 14 There was a conversation about somebody named 15 Vinnie and Mr. Hutchins' relationship with that person? 16 Α Yes. 17 A conversation about Beta Monkey? 18 Yes. Α 19 Is that a person or a thing? 20 It's an online nick. So, yeah, it's a person. Α "Nick" is a nickname? 21 22 Yeah. Α 23 All right. And then conversation ultimately about Q 24 WannaCry? 25 Yeah. There was a portion of questions related to WannaCry.

- Q Then as things are sort of starting to wind down, at some point you do ask Mr. Hutchins whether he has any questions for you, right?
  - A I asked it a couple times, yeah.
  - Q You recall a couple times?
- A Well, they're not all in the recording; but, yeah.

  I mean, at the end, I was asking him if he had any
  questions.
- Q And at the end when you asked him that on the recorded portion of the interview, his question is why the hell he's here, right?
- A Yeah, if you say so. I'd have to go look at the exact transcript.
  - Q Or listen to the recording?
  - A I've listened to the recording.
- Q But I think this is important. At no point during this 90 minute or hour and 45 minute interview was it shared with Mr. Hutchins the reality that any arrest warrant rested on a Wisconsin indictment charging a variety of Kronos-related offenses, right?
  - A Can you ask your question again?
- Q Sure. At no time during this 90 minute or hour and 45 minute interview did you or Agent Butcher share with Mr. Hutchins the reality that the arrest warrant flowed from

an indictment here in Wisconsin accusing him of Kronos-related offenses?

A No, that's not correct. He was presented with the cover sheet for the arrest warrant. We talked about where we were from, what we did, the investigations that we investigate. We didn't go into any specific detail related to the case information because I wanted to know if he was lying about information. I wanted to be aware of it. But the criteria under why we were there, why he was under handcuffs — now, he continued throughout that interview to question why he was there because he thought he was there related to WannaCry, which had nothing to do with the reason we were there.

Q So to the extent that these details you just spoke about, to the extent you shared those with Mr. Hutchins, those were on the prerecorded portion of your encounter?

A It was.

Q You testified about a bathroom break, burger, and opportunity to connect with his mother in England, right?

A In the UK, correct.

Q Yeah. Those were all things that happened after the interview was completed, right?

A No. There was water waiting for him when he showed up. I remember getting change to put in the vending machine before he --

1 Burger, bathroom, opportunity to connect with his 2 Those were things that happened at the conclusion mother. 3 of the interview, right? 4 Correct. 5 Now, I want to visit with you a little bit about 6 your understanding of Mr. Hutchins' activities while he was 7 in Las Vegas. Are you with me? 8 I wasn't aware of all of his activities, but I'll 9 answer what I can. 10 All right. Well, just so we're clear, when you 11 ran into Mr. Hutchins in the Las Vegas airport on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, this wasn't coincidental, right? 12 13 No, it wasn't. 14 You and fellow agents had been aware of his 15 presence in Las Vegas for the previous week to 10 days, 16 right? 17 Correct. 18 And a decision was made to attempt his arrest, to 19 execute the arrest warrant in connection with his outbound 20 flight, right? 21 Α Correct. 22 That wasn't something the warrant demanded of you. 23 That was a law enforcement, strategic decision, right? 24 Α Correct. 25 And in realtime, though you hadn't met

Mr. Hutchins, you knew him to be young, right? 1 2 Α Correct. 3 You knew him to be a male? 4 Α Correct. 5 You knew him to be in Las Vegas for a conference, 6 right? 7 Α Correct. 8 And so whatever the reasons were for planning the 9 arrest for being in connection with his outbound flight, the 10 reality of things is that Hutchins' presence was known to 11 law enforcement over the previous week, and he was allowed 12 to participate in the Vegas experience over that period of 13 time, right? 14 I can't answer that. I'm not sure what you're 15 asking. 16 He was free to do in Las Vegas whatever anybody 17 chooses to do in Las Vegas for a week, right? He wasn't under arrest at that time. 18 19 Right. And he was free to experience Las Vegas in 20 whatever way he chose? 21 Sure. Α 22 Also, in connection with the arrest, the presence 23 of CBP officers, that was also not coincidental, right? 24 I had to be escorted through the terminal. 25 All right. And you had been in contact with CBP

in advance of arriving to the airport on August  $2^{\mathrm{nd}}$ , 1 2 right? 3 Correct. 4 And, initially, sort of the working plan was that 5 you were going to perfect or execute Mr. Hutchins' arrest 6 consistent with the way CBP does things, right? 7 Those tactics were discussed. Α 8 And those tactics involved making the arrest as 9 the wanted person attempts to board the plane, right? 10 That's the way CBP typically does it. Α 11 And that was the plan, but you wanted to allow for 12 one contingency, correct? 13 Α Correct. 14 And the contingency you were concerned about was if Mr. Hutchins were to start drinking? 15 16 Yes. 17 And by "drinking," I assume we don't mean Coke or 18 water. We mean alcohol, right? 19 Yeah. The consumption of alcohol. 20 And so going in to attempt and execute this 21 arrest, you were concerned about the possibility of 22 Mr. Hutchins having basically even one sip of alcohol, 23 right? That was a concern to you? Yeah. Any consumption of alcohol would be a 24 25 concern, right.

And based on that concern, what your sort of 1 2 amendment to the CBP arrest protocol was is to suggest that 3 if he's seen ordering a drink, we should pull him out of the 4 terminal, right? 5 Α It was a little more detailed than that; but, 6 yeah, generally. 7 Yeah. And so the fact of the matter is that as 8 things eventually played out, Mr. Hutchins' order of what 9 turned out to be a Coca-Cola triggered that contingency, 10 right? 11 It's true. 12 You and other officers were concerned that, "Oh, 13 he may have ordered an alcoholic beverage. Let's get him 14 out of there before he has a chance to drink anything"? 15 Α Correct. 16 All right. Now, today it's your testimony that 17 early on in the interview -- and I take it this is the part 18 that's not recorded, right? You asked Mr. Hutchins whether 19 he had anything to drink that day? Well, it came up in discussion, "Why did you 20 21 interact with me in the lounge?" 22 And we spelled it out for him. I said, "I was 23 worried about you drinking any alcohol." 24 And that's when the, "No, I don't drink alcohol

before international flights because it makes me

25

1 dehydrated." 2 Well, isn't it true that you plainly asked him if 3 he had anything alcoholic to drink that day? I think that's true also. 4 5 All right. And he said, "No," right? 6 Α My understanding, yeah. 7 Your understanding. You were the one asking the 8 questions and hearing the answer, right? 9 I don't remember who asked the question, but I do 10 remember the answer was "No." 11 All right. 12 I do remember the other part with not drinking 13 before international flights. That's what sticks with me. 14 Q Got you. 15 And you were asking about alcohol consumed or not 16 consumed that day, correct? 17 I don't remember specifying a timeline. 18 Agent Chartier, you wrote a report exclusively 19 detailing this particular portion of your dialogue with 20 Mr. Hutchins, right? 21 It was probably Agent Butcher that wrote the 22 report. 23 I'm handing you what's been marked for 24 identification as Defendant's Exhibit No. 1. 25

Do you mind taking a look at that just to

1 yourself? 2 Yeah, I see it. Α So on December 9<sup>th</sup> of last year, Agent Butcher 3 4 authored a report, correct? 5 She did. Α 6 And that report is a one paragraph report, right? 7 It is. Α 8 And that report is devoted exclusively to noting 9 that, prior to initiating the interview of Marcus Hutchins, 10 that you, Agent Chartier, inquired if Hutchins had been 11 drinking the day of the arrest, right? 12 That's what it says. 13 And is that accurate? 14 If it says that, I'm sure I did it. 15 All right. And then the report goes on to say 16 that Hutchins stated that he had not been drinking that day, 17 correct? 18 It does. And then it goes on to talk in terms of his 19 20 distaste for drinking before a long international flight, 21 right? 22 Correct. Α 23 So the focus was on alcohol consumption that particular day, right? 24 25 I don't know that that was the focus, but

1 certainly any alcohol consumption was the focus. 2 Whatever reference to alcohol consumption is to 3 that day, correct? 4 That's the way it's worded here, yes. 5 And that day would've really amounted to that 6 morning, right? 7 Α Correct. 8 Where he's in your custody, essentially, as of 9 1:17 p.m., right? 10 Correct. 11 He had been at the airport for a couple hours before then, right? 12 13 Α Correct. 14 All right. What you didn't ask about was anything 15 having to do with the ingestion of other mind-altering 16 substances, right? 17 No, I didn't. Α 18 Marijuana, synthetic marijuana, right? Q 19 No. Club drugs like Molly, ecstasy, things like that? 20 Q 21 No, I didn't ask him. Α 22 Misused prescription drugs like Adderall or Q 23 something of that nature? 24 Α No. 25 Q No questions about that, right?

1 Α No. There was also -- at this particular point, before 2 0 3 the interview kind of gets rolling, there wasn't discussion 4 of what Mr. Hutchins' consumption of alcohol and/or drugs 5 may have been over the preceding 7 to 10 days that he had 6 been in Las Vegas, right? 7 I didn't see how that was relevant. Α No. I was 8 interacting with him. He was answering questions. I didn't 9 see any reason to go into that little of detail. 10 But the fact of the matter is your questions were 11 limited to alcohol, right? 12 Correct. 13 And as we've already established, alcohol 14 consumption, or the lack of it, that day, right? 15 Α Correct. 16 All right. As the 90-or-so-minute interview 17 proceeded, you did start learning a little bit more about 18 Mr. Hutchins' activities while he had been in Las Vegas, 19 right? 20 Yes. 21 He talked of his wallet having been stolen at a 22 pool party, right?

A He did.

Q We're grown-ups here. Las Vegas pool parties are more about bikinis and beer than, like, kids in the water

23

24

25

1 playing Marco Polo, right? 2 MR. CHMELAR: Object. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. 4 THE WITNESS: What was the question again? 5 BY MR. STILLER: 6 The Las Vegas pool party scene is kind of more 7 about bikinis and beer than little kids playing Marco Polo, 8 right? 9 It's been a long time since I've been to Vegas, 10 but I assume so. 11 And at some point, Agent Butcher kind of asked 12 innocent questions to Mr. Hutchins about the conference he 13 had been there to attend, right? 14 Α Correct. 15 And in response to those questions, Mr. Hutchins 16 said he hadn't attended any of the conference, right? 17 I believe that's correct. 18 He said he just came for the parties? 19 I do remember that statement. 20 He described himself as an introvert and said that 21 to participate in the networking surrounding the conference, 22 he needed to be drunk, right? 23 I do remember a comment about liquid courage. 24 Q In fact, "liquid courage" was your label, right? 25 (Affirmative nod.)

1 Later on in the interview, I think Mr. Hutchins 2 may have yawned, and it caused you to ask how much sleep he 3 got the night before. Do you remember that? 4 I don't recall. 5 You don't recall him telling you that he had 6 gotten no sleep at all before adding that he went to bed for 7 about two hours? 8 I do remember the two-hour comment. 9 All right. So to the extent Mr. Hutchins told you 10 that the night before he hadn't gotten to bed except for two 11 hours, that would've been the night leading into his arrest, 12 right? 13 Correct. Α 14 And you asked no questions whatsoever about 15 "Mr. Hutchins, what kept you up so late last night"? 16 No follow-up, right? 17 No, I did not. 18 I think where I want to finish up is generally 19 with respect to documenting and memorializing investigative 20 Are you with me? efforts. 21 Α Sure. 22 So certainly the audio recording in this case is a 23 way of memorializing what was said between Mr. Hutchins and you and Agent Butcher on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, right? 24 25 Α Okay.

1 0 Is that correct? 2 I don't understand the question. Sorry. Α 3 The audio recording memorializes the conversation? Q 4 Yes, it does. 5 All right. Reports written at or near the time of 6 the conversation memorialized what happened in the 7 conversation, right? 8 They do. 9 I showed you Agent Butcher's report from December 9<sup>th</sup>, right? 10 December 8<sup>th</sup>? 11 December 8<sup>th</sup>. I'm sorry. 12 13 A Yes, you did. The one about you advising -- or asking 14 15 Mr. Hutchins about whether he had anything to drink that 16 day, right? 17 Α Correct. 18 Agent Butcher had written a report memorializing the August 2<sup>nd</sup> interview closer in time to the interview, 19 20 right? 21 Wrote a report? The interview report? 22 The 302. 0 23 Yes, the 302. 24 A different one than the one that's in front of 0 25 you?

1 Α Correct. 2 And that report that Agent Butcher wrote closer in 3 time to the interview, it made no mention of questions about 4 alcohol consumption, right? 5 It's a long report. I think that was more 6 reflective of the recording, my understanding. 7 You've seen the report, right? 8 I have seen the report. I don't remember specific 9 questions about alcohol on it, and I think that's why this 10 was done after the fact. Four or five months after the fact? 11 12 Apparently. August 2<sup>nd</sup>? December 8<sup>th</sup>? 13 14 Yeah. 15 All right. But that sort of proves -- I think 16 suggests an important point. When something in the 17 investigation happens after the fact, you create a report 18 reflecting what that sort of different vision might be, 19 right? 20 Yes. 21 I want to pass up to you -- I think it's Exhibit That's the Government exhibit. That's the Advisement of 22 23 Rights form, right? 24 That it is.

25

And at the top of the form, it sets forth a time,

1 right, or a series of times? 2 Yes, it does. 3 And down at the bottom of the form in connection 4 with your signature and Agent Butcher's signature, it again 5 reflects a series of times, right? 6 Α It does. 7 And the series of the times at the bottom of the 8 form is the same as the series of times at the top of the 9 form, right? 10 Α Yes. 11 And in each place, three times are listed, 12 correct? 13 Α Correct. 14 And in each place, two of the three times are 15 crossed out? 16 They are. 17 As you sit here today, are you aware that Agent Butcher, sometime after August 2<sup>nd</sup>, wrote those 18 19 times on the form? 20 I am aware of that. It was a mistake at the time, 21 and it wasn't noted. 22 The question is when did you first become aware of 23 that? 24 I don't specifically recall. It was a busy time. 25 Probably a month after.

1 All right. At any point, did you write a 302 2 memorializing that after the fact, the Advisement of Rights 3 form had been modified to reflect a variety of times? 4 I'm not the case agent assigned to this. I was 5 helping out that day. That's something you would have to 6 ask Special Agent Butcher. 7 Well, the question was whether you wrote any 8 report? 9 Α I did not write a report, but I also did not 10 modify this form. 11 That was Agent Butcher? 12 That was Agent Butcher. 13 And when you say you learned about it a -- you 14 estimate that you learned of that circumstance about a month 15 after it occurred. Roughly, when would that have been? 16 I don't recall the specific date. Like I said, 17 this is something I was helping out on. I wasn't the 18 primary case agent. So it's not necessarily my -- it 19 wouldn't be my role to deal with any mistakes or problems 20 So I don't specifically recall the exact day. with it. 21 Let me try and help you out. 22 Okay. Α Today is May 16<sup>th</sup>. 23 24 Α Okay. 25 Q We talked already about the time last month in

1 April when you met with Mr. Chmelar and Mr. Proctor for the 2 sake of preparing for testimony at the next day's hearing. 3 Do you remember that? 4 Yeah. Correct. 5 You recall that mid-April? 6 Α Uh-huh. 7 How much in advance of mid-April might it have 8 been that you learned about the change to the Advisement of 9 Rights form? 10 Well, like I said, approximately a month after 11 this happened. So it would've been, what? September? The beginning of September, I found out that the time wasn't 12 13 recorded on here. We talked about the fact that as of August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 14 15 you knew that Mr. Hutchins was a male and young, and so on and so forth, right? 16 17 Uh-huh. Α 18 You also knew that he was a resident and citizen of the UK? 19 20 I did. Α 21 MR. STILLER: I've got nothing further. 22 you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything further, Mr. Chmelar. 24 25 MR. CHMELAR: I do, Judge. Just a few questions.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MR. CHMELAR:

Q Agent Chartier, you were asked some questions by Mr. Stiller about advising Mr. Hutchins of the nature of the arrest and the reason he was under arrest.

Do you recall a specific time during the interview on the recording where it could be heard that you actually show him and hand him the arrest warrant issued out of the Eastern District of Wisconsin?

- A A specific time on the recording?
- Q Right. Do you recall the recording reflecting a time when you handed him the arrest warrant? He can be heard in a way -- handing him the warrant and redoing the warrant?
  - A I don't specifically.
  - Q If it's on the recording, it's on the recording?
  - A If it's on the recording, it's on the recording.
- Q Do you recall specifically handing him the arrest warrant from the Eastern District of Wisconsin?
  - A Yeah, I do.
- Q Okay. Mr. Stiller asked you a number of questions about whether or not, you know, the nature of the investigation and what you had told him or what you hadn't told him.

Do you recall a certain point where Mr. Hutchins

asked specifically if the case was about Kronos, the 1 2 interview related to Kronos, and if you were looking for the 3 developer? 4 Α I do. 5 And what did you respond? 6 Α I said I don't think we're looking anymore. 7 And why did you say that? 8 Because it was our belief that Mr. Hutchins was 9 the developer of Kronos. 10 And Mr. Stiller asked you about other parts of the 11 interview that related to, you know, other segments of the 12 interview. He talked about unlocking the phones, needing 13 consent, and, you know, identifying yourself and things like 14 that. He asked you about a portion of the interview that dealt with WannaCry. Do you remember that? 15 16 T do. 17 What portion of the interview related to WannaCry 18 in relation to the Kronos investigation? 19 It was the end of the interview. Just some 20 questions that we had. 21 Was there a portion of the interview that dealt with an individual that's been indicted with Mr. Hutchins? 22 23 You know there's a co-defendant on this case, 24 correct? 25 Yes.

1 0 Did you discuss that individual with Mr. Hutchins? 2 Yes, we did. Α 3 Did you question him about the identity and the 4 location -- the true identity of that individual and the 5 location of that individual? 6 Α We did. 7 Was there a discussion about his ability to 8 identify the individual? 9 Yes, there was. 10 And that was all in the context of Kronos? 11 Yes, it was. Mr. Stiller asked you a number of questions 12 13 regarding the time listed on the Advice of Rights form, 14 Exhibit 9. Do you remember that? 15 Α Yes. 16 Regardless of the times that are written on there, 17 do you have any doubt that you orally advised Mr. Hutchins 18 of his rights by reading that form and then handing him that 19 form before the interview started? 20 No doubt. 21 Do you have any doubt that that was done before 22 the recording was started? 23 No doubt. I want to ask you just briefly about the recording 24 25 device and the circumstances in which the device was used.

1 The interview room that you used, was it a CBP interview 2 room? 3 It was. 4 That's customs and border patrol. That's what the 5 acronym stands for, right, "CBP"? 6 Α Correct. 7 Do you know what I mean by -- when I ask you if it 8 was prewired? 9 Α Yes, I do. 10 What does that mean? 11 It means that the room is hard wired for video and Α audio. 12 13 And was this particular room, the interview room 14 you were using, prewired? 15 Yes, it was. 16 And did you use the prewired system? No, we weren't able to. It wasn't functional that 17 Α 18 day. 19 And as a result, what did you do? 20 We went to our backup, which was the handheld 21 digital recorder. 22 In the normal course of interviews -- and you 23 already indicated you conducted approximately 20 in-custody interviews. At a time when interviews are recorded, and 24 25 you're the interviewing agent, meaning you're in the room

with the in-custody individual, is that -- in your 1 2 experience, is that normally the interviewing agent's 3 responsibility to activate or deactivate the recording 4 equipment? 5 If it's prewired, it's done outside the room. Α 6 I just want to go back to one other thing. You 7 recall that I asked you about a portion of the interview 8 that dealt with WannaCry and how it related to the overall 9 length of the interview. Would it be accurate to say that 10 from your review and your recall of the interview, that the 11 portion that dealt with WannaCry was minimal? 12 Yes, it was. 13 During the interview, we talked about showing what 14 you described as a string to Mr. Hutchins? 15 Α Yes. 16 What did that string relate to, as far as you 17 know? 18 Α Kronos. 19 Was there any verbiage in there in this string 20 that identified it as Kronos? 21 Yes, there was. 22 What was it? 0 23 It just spelled out "Kronos."

was currently indicted with and that the questions related

With respect to the co-defendant that Mr. Hutchins

24

25

1 to that individual, were there additional questions on the 2 recording and during the interview that related to that 3 individual's role with respect to Mr. Hutchins and his 4 experience and history with that individual? 5 Yes, there was. 6 That all related to Kronos, correct? 7 Α Correct. 8 MR. CHMELAR: Can I have one moment, Judge? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 That's it, Judge. Thank you. MR. CHMELAR: 11 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Stiller? 12 One narrow area, Your Honor. MR. STILLER: 13 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. STILLER: 15 Agent Chartier, this idea of the malfunctioning 16 hard wiring for audio and video recording in the CBP 17 interview room, when did that become known to you and/or 18 Agent Butcher? 19 The day of. 20 Before Mr. Hutchins arrived to the room, correct? 21 Correct. 22 MR. STILLER: Nothing further, Your Honor. 23 Can I clarify one response on the THE WITNESS: 24 Vegas question that he had earlier? 25 THE COURT: No. You have to answer the questions that are before you, Agent.

THE WITNESS: All right.

THE COURT: And I do have a couple of

clarification questions for you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

### EXAMINATION

## BY THE COURT:

Q So when I go to listen to this audiotape, from -the testimony is that it starts -- the conversation has
already started; is that correct?

A It has.

Q Okay. So what went on before what I'm going to hear on the audio?

A It's pretty much the context of informing him why we're there, showing the warrant, identifying ourselves, where we came from, what we're here to talk -- generally talk about that day. And then beginning the discussion of the Advice of Rights, showing it to him after we've read it, asking him if he can read it. If he agrees to what's written there, please sign below.

And I think at the end, when the recording starts, you can still hear us talking through some of the forms is when the recording was started, and that was all at the beginning of that interview.

So to give you an idea, the range of time, 5, 10

minutes maybe. Yeah, I think it was just an oversight.

Q I think you just answered. Why wasn't the interview recorded from the very beginning, this 5 to 10 minutes section that you just summarized for me, why was that not also recorded?

A As you could well imagine, it was a little chaotic at the time. We had to deal with CBP. We were having to deal with counselor notifications. You know, we were talking about looking at the phones and laptops. So there was a lot of moving parts. And I think it was just -- it was an oversight.

Q And where the interview ends in the recording, is there additional interview or interaction that is not recorded after that?

A There was a period of time where he's eating food and just kind of casually asking questions. But there was no questions from, really, us that were case specific. It was just banter back and forth, waiting until we can get transportation for him to the Henderson County correctional facility.

Q During the course of the interview, either the recorded portion or the unrecorded 5 to 10 minutes before, did you obtain pedigree information from Mr. Hutchins? By "pedigree," I mean background information?

A No.

1 So no question about how old you are? The usual 2 questions. 3 Α Yeah. I think we asked him for an identifying 4 document. I don't remember if that happened before. I 5 thought some of that was on the recorded portion of it. 6 No questions about education? 7 It's all on the recorded. 8 THE COURT: Those are my questions. Any questions 9 specific to the questions that I asked? Mr. Chmelar? 10 MR. CHMELAR: Yes, just one. 11 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. CHMELAR: 12 13 As far as the background questions the judge was 14 just asking you about, I know you mentioned some of the recording -- some of those questions, background information 15 16 are captured in the recording. Did you also know about 17 Mr. Hutchins prior to the interview? 18 Yes, I did. Α 19 You had some background information about him? 20 Correct. 21 Did you know him to be operating a blog, a 22 computer security blog? 23 Yes, I did. 24 That was in English and dealt with pretty 25 technical aspects of computer science, correct?

1	A Correct.
2	MR. CHMELAR: I don't have any other questions,
3	Judge.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stiller, any questions from
5	my questions or Mr. Chmelar's questions specifically?
6	MR. STILLER: No, thank you.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. You may step
8	down. Please do not discuss your testimony with any other
9	witnesses.
10	MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, at this time, the United
11	States calls Agent Butcher.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Klein, you're raising your hand.
13	MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, Mr. Hutchins would like to
14	use the restroom, if we can take a quick break.
15	THE COURT: Let's take a quick break before we
16	swear in our next witness. Five minutes.
17	(Break.)
18	JAMIE BUTCHER, WITNESS, SWORN
19	THE CLERK: Would you please state your name and
20	spell your last name for the record?
21	THE WITNESS: Sure. Jamie Butcher, B-U-T-C-H-E-R.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. PROCTOR:
24	Q Good afternoon. How are you employed?
25	A I'm a special agent with the FBI.

1	Q	And how long have you been a special agent with
2	the FBI?	
3	А	Approximately three years.
4	Q	And where are you currently assigned?
5	А	In Milwaukee.
6	Q	And what are your current duties?
7	А	I am on the cyber intrusion squad. So cyber
8	intrusion	matters.
9	Q	How long have you been with the cyber intrusion
10	squad?	
11	А	For approximately six years. I did cyber
12	intrusion	work in my previous capacity with the FBI as well.
13	Q	So your entire career in Milwaukee as a special
14	agent has	been working on cyber-related issues?
15	А	Yeah.
16	Q	And then before serving as a special agent in
17	Milwaukee	, you said you were working on cyber-related
18	issues. Y	What capacity was that?
19	А	I was a staff operations specialist, which is
20	basically	a tactical analyst supporting case work.
21	Q	And that's with the FBI?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	And where was that?
24	А	In New York.
25	Q	And how long did you do that?

1	А	Approximately three years.
2	Q	And what did you do immediately before that?
3	А	I was in an administrative capacity with the FBI
4	as well.	
5	Q	And that was in New York?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And what did you do before that?
8	А	I was in the advertising and marketing industry.
9	Q	And where was that?
10	А	That was two years after college.
11	Q	And where?
12	А	In New York.
13	Q	Okay. And before that was college?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Now, did you become involved in an investigation
16	that ulti	mately led to the arrest of Marcus Hutchins?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Do you recall when he was arrested?
19	А	August 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2017.
20	Q	Where did that occur?
21	А	In Las Vegas.
22	Q	And did you participate in an interview of Marcus
23	Hutchins	on that day?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Can you describe the circumstances of when you

first interacted and observed Mr. Hutchins on that day?

A Yes. I was waiting in the secured area in the airport downstairs to interview rooms, a lobby area and a restroom that's controlled by CBP and other security personnel at the airport. And Special Agent Chartier and a CBP officer had gone to take Mr. Hutchins into custody from the lounge in the airport.

- Q And then they brought him down to where you were?
- A Yes.

Q And then what happened?

A And then we went into the interview room, myself, Mr. Hutchins, Mr. Chartier. Mr. Hutchins was uncuffed and shown a seat in the interview room facing the door with the table in between myself and him, and Agent Chartier was at the end of the table.

- Q So it was the three of you in the interview room?
- A Yes.
- Q What were you wearing?
- A Plain clothes with kind of a drapey cardigan for concealment purposes.
- Q Were you wearing anything identifying yourself on the exterior as an FBI agent?
  - A No.
- Q Did you have credentials that identified you as an FBI agent?

1	1 A Yes. We	identified ourselves to Mr. Hutchins
2	2 after entering the	interview room with credentials.
3	Q Were you	armed?
4	A Yes.	
5	Q And where	e was your firearm?
6	6 A On my hij	o.
7	7 Q Was it is	n plain sight or was it concealed?
8	8 A It should	d've been concealed by my cardigan, yes.
9	9 Q Now, are	you familiar with Miranda warnings?
10	A Yes.	
11	Q And when	, typically in your experience and
12	training, when are	those given in an interview?
13	A Before b	eginning any questioning of the person in
14	custody.	
15	Q Now, when	n you and Mr. Hutchins and Mr.
16	Chartier were o	r Special Agent Chartier were in the
17	interview room, was	s Mr. Hutchins advised of his Miranda
18	warnings?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q When did	that happen?
21	A Before a	ny questioning began. Shortly after we
22	got into the inter	view room.
23	Q Can you	just describe how that process went
24	forward?	
25	A Special A	Agent Chartier read the rights from the

1 form directly to Mr. Hutchins. He passed him the form and 2 asked if he could read out loud the portion that says that 3 "I understand and certify these rights," and asked, if he 4 agreed to speak to us, if he would sign the form, which he 5 did. 6 In front of you, I've placed several exhibits. 7 One of them is marked Exhibit 9. Can you locate that? 8 Α Yes. 9 Is that the form that you're referring to? 10 Α Yes. 11 And do you recognize signatures on that form? 12 Yes. 13 And what signatures do you recognize? Q 14 Mr. Hutchins, myself, and Agent Chartier. Α 15 And you recognize the other ones besides yourself 16 because you were present at the moment they were signed? 17 Α Yes. 18 Can you take a look at Exhibit 8 in front of you? 19 Do you recognize Exhibit 8? 20 Yes. 21 How do you recognize Exhibit 8? 22 It's a form that is an acknowledgment that it's 23 illegal to lie to an FBI agent. 24 Was that form presented to Mr. Hutchins? 25 Α Yes.

1 0 When was that presented to Mr. Hutchins? 2 Shortly after the Miranda rights form. 3 And what happened regarding that form with 4 Mr. Hutchins? 5 Α He signed that one as well. 6 Can you take a look at what's marked as Exhibit 4 7 in front of you? 8 Uh-huh. 9 Do you recognize Exhibit 4? 10 Α Yes. 11 What is Exhibit 4? It's a Consent to Search form that includes 12 13 phones, laptops, a backpack, and a USB drive. 14 And do you recognize signatures on that form? 15 Yes. 16 And what signatures do you recognize? 17 Mr. Hutchins and myself. 18 Did you witness Mr. Hutchins sign that form? Q 19 Yes. 20 And when was that form presented to Mr. Hutchins? 21 It was a few minutes into the interview. We had 22 gotten verbal consent prior to the form. And then before 23 any searches began, the form was signed. It's on the recording. 24 25 So after Mr. Hutchins signed these forms, at some

1 point did you begin substantive questioning? 2 Α Yes. 3 I mean, you and Special Agent Chartier? 4 Α Yes. 5 And you participated in asking those questions? 6 Α Yes. 7 In your personal, professional experience, have 8 you encountered people who are intoxicated? 9 Α Yes. 10 And did Marcus Hutchins appear intoxicated at that 11 time? 12 No. 13 Did he seem lucid? 14 Yes. 15 And in your professional and personal experience, 16 can someone be somewhat intoxicated and still understand 17 what's going on? 18 Α Yes. 19 Based on your interaction with Mr. Hutchins that 20 day, did it appear to you that he understood what was going 21 on? 22 Yes. He asked several follow-up questions when he Α 23 didn't understand a question we had asked. 24 Did you present documents to Mr. Hutchins during 25 the course of the interview?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And did he review and comment on those documents?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Would you say he demonstrated a knowledge of
5	computers and cyber issues based on your interaction?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Was he able to recall items from his memory?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Is there any reason that he gave you to question
10	whether or not he understood what was going on at that time?
11	A No.
12	Q Can you describe the tone of the conversation of
13	the interview?
14	A For the most part, it was pretty light. There
15	were several jokes made by Mr. Hutchins and ourselves during
16	the interview. There's several instances of laughter during
17	the interview. It was pretty casual, I would say.
18	Q How would you describe Mr. Hutchins' answering of
19	questions during the course of the interview?
20	A He asked several follow-up questions but kind of
21	held back a bit in several of the questions, I think.
22	Q In his answers to you?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Would you call it minimizing?
25	A Yes.

1 How long did the interview take? 2 A little under two hours. 3 During the course of this interview, did you or Q 4 Special Agent Chartier threaten to punish Mr. Hutchins or 5 his family if he didn't talk to you? 6 Α No. 7 Did you make promises that he would get rewards if 8 he talked to you? 9 Α No. 10 Was Mr. Hutchins offered water? 11 There was one on the table there for him Yes. 12 when he came into the room. 13 And was he offered food at any point? 14 Yes, later on in the interview. 15 And was he allowed to use the bathroom? 16 Yes. 17 How was the temperature in the room? Was it 18 excessively hot or cold? No. And that's on the recording too. 19 20 Agent Chartier felt a little warm, but myself and 21 Mr. Hutchins stated that we feel quite fine. 22 Was this interview recorded? 0 23 Yes. 24 And how was it recorded? 0 25 With a handheld recorder.

1	Q And whose handheld recorder was it?
2	A It's the possession of the FBI.
3	Q And who had custody of it that day?
4	A I did.
5	Q And do you know if the room you were in was wired
6	for recording?
7	A It was, but it was broken. We had talked to the
8	CBP agents that morning, and they told us it was inoperable.
9	Q Now, are you familiar with rooms that are
10	interview rooms that are wired for recording?
11	A Yes. That's typically how we conduct any
12	custodial interview.
13	Q And if a room is wired for recording, who's
14	responsible for turning that system on, the agents in the
15	room conducting the interview or somebody else?
16	A Someone else so the agents can focus on conducting
17	the interview.
18	Q Whose job was it to record the interview with the
19	room wiring being down?
20	A Mine.
21	Q I represent to you that Exhibit 1 has been
22	admitted into evidence. It's a recording of the interview.
23	Are you familiar with the recording of the interview?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Now, does that recording of the interview include

the reading of Miranda and the filling out of the form that 1 2 you testified to earlier? 3 No. Α 4 Why not? 5 The interview was moving at kind of a quick pace, 6 and because I was focused on getting the Miranda warnings 7 and everything signed off, I forgot to push the button. And 8 I realized that, as we began questioning, that I hadn't 9 started the recording yet. 10 So would you call that a mistake? 11 Yes. 12 What prompted you starting the recording? 13 Agent Chartier had started to ask some questions, 14 and I realized I just hadn't started it yet. 15 And by "questions," you mean substantive 16 questions? 17 Α Yes. 18 The kinds of questions that would elicit possibly 19 an incriminating statement? 20 Yes. 21 I'm going to go back to Exhibit 9, which is in 22 front of you. You mentioned earlier that Mr. Hutchins' 23 signature is on there as well as yours and Special Agent 24 Chartier's. Did you sign that document around the time that

Mr. Hutchins signed the document?

25

1 Α Yes. 2 Now, towards the top of the document, there's a 3 portion that says "Time." And then after the signatures, 4 towards the bottom of the document, there's a portion that 5 says "Time." Do you see that? 6 Α Yes. 7 What's going on there? 8 I did not fill out the time at the time of the 9 signing of the warnings, and I tried to recreate it shortly 10 thereafter, and I realized when I was doing my paperwork 11 that it was incorrect. So I attempted to recreate it and 12 put the approximate times there. 13 So you wrote down "11:08" at one point? 14 I did. Α 15 Okay. And then you crossed that out? 16 Yes. 17 And then you wrote "2:08", or squiggly line 2:08? 18 Yes. Α 19 And what does the squiggly line mean? 20 Approximate. Α 21 And you crossed that out? Q 22 Yes. Α 23 And then later you wrote the approximate symbol, and then 1:18? 24 25 Yes.

1 And this was part of your attempt to recreate the 0 2 time? 3 Α Yes. 4 In recreating the times, were you recognizing that 5 the times that you previously listed were wrong? 6 Α Yes. 7 What did you do to go about to try to recreate 8 these times? 9 When I had the final time, the 1:18 which I 10 believe to be approximately correct, within 10 minutes of 11 the time that it was actually signed, I had the faxed 12 information that was sent to the consulate by my coworker. 13 I had surveillance logs from the individuals in Las Vegas 14 and other documentation that had time indications on it that 15 I didn't have when I had the previous times. 16 Why didn't you write down the time when the 17 signatures were put on that form? 18 I just got caught up in the interview process. 19 So you were just trying to move forward with the 20 interview? 21 Α Yeah. 22 Any question that that document was reviewed and 23 signed by Marcus Hutchins before you started recording the interview? 24 25 No.

1	Q You wrote a report about that interview?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And in that report, did you note when Mr. Hutchins
4	was advised of his rights?
5	A No, but that he was advised of his rights.
6	Q My apologies. I think I phrased that question
7	wrong.
8	In that report, do you indicate that Mr. Hutchins
9	was advised of his rights at one point?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And you indicate that he was advised of those
12	rights before the substantive questioning started?
13	A Yes.
14	Q After the interview concluded, where did
15	Marcus Hutchins go?
16	A To Henderson Detention Center, which is the local
17	county facility.
18	Q And are you aware whether or not he made any calls
19	while at that facility?
20	A Yes, two calls.
21	Q Two calls.
22	And how did you find that out?
23	A We requested the calls from the local department,
24	and they gave me a list of calls in the range that
25	Mr. Hutchins was allowed to make phone calls. And I knew

1 the phone number of his local contact, the only contact in 2 the U.S., his boss, which I had provided him the number for, 3 and I was able to recognize that number in the metadata of 4 those calls. And then his voice was on the call as well as 5 his name for both of them. 6 I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 2. 7 Are you familiar with Exhibit 2? 8 Α Yes. 9 0 What is Exhibit 2? The first phone call that Mr. Hutchins made from 10 11 the county jail. 12 And how do you recognize that? 13 I reviewed it prior to this hearing. Α 14 MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, at this time, I move admission of Exhibit 2. 15 16 THE COURT: Any objection? 17 MR. KLEIN: Just our previously entered one, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Klein. 20 It is received. 21 BY MR. PROCTOR: 22 I've just handed you what's been marked as Exhibit 23 Are you familiar with Exhibit 7? 24 Α Yes. 25 Q What is Exhibit 7?

A transcript of the first phone call made from the 1 2 jail. 3 Did you prepare this document? 4 Yes. 5 And how did you prepare this document? 6 I listened to the call and transcribed to the best 7 of my ability. 8 And there's a date and a time on the front page of 9 Exhibit 7. How did you obtain those dates and times? 10 It was included in the metadata that we received 11 for the calls. Did anybody else review this transcript before 12 13 today before you submitted it? 14 Yes. Α 15 A colleague? 16 Yes. 17 MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, at this time, I'd move Exhibit 7. 18 19 THE COURT: Mr. Klein. MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we object, and I'll 20 21 There are some slight, in our view -- I listened 22 to the jail calls. We believe there are some slight 23 inaccuracies in this. So we would ask Your Honor, if you're 24 going to review this evidence, that you should listen to the actual calls themselves, if you want to rely on an aid. But 25

1 you shouldn't rely on this as actual evidence because there 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 forward. 10 11 12 itself what is actually said. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 BY MR. PROCTOR: 21 22 23 summarize various passages in here. 24

25

are some slight inconsistencies based on our review of it. THE COURT: Mr. Proctor, do you wish to respond? MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, in the interest of time, my hope is to move through the transcript rather than play the audio today and highlight a few things. If the defense believes there are inconsistencies, I'm open to hearing what they are. But for purposes of today, I think the most efficient way is to admit it and then allow us to move The Court can review the audio and determine for THE COURT: Mr. Klein, anything further on that? MR. KLEIN: Just that objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. So, of course, the audio itself is the primary source, and that's what I'll listen to. For now, I'll consider the reference of the transcript as an aid. And to the extent there are discrepancies, the audio, of course, will control. I'm going to move through the transcript with you and highlight a few things. I'm going to ask you to read or So if you can turn to page 2. Under the first entry listed as "System," is there an indication made that

this call is recorded? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 And moving on a few lines down, the second entry 4 listed as "Hutchins," does Mr. Hutchins indicate why he 5 believes he was arrested? 6 Α Yes. 7 What does he say? 8 That he used to write malware, and "they picked me 9 up on some old shit." 10 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, you know, our objection is 11 not based on these tapes are inaccurate tapes of jail calls, 12 it's more on the relevance of this. 13 In the interest of time, I don't know that it 14 makes sense to walk through what they view as having the 15 agent repeat what is actually on the tape to Your Honor. 16 It seems like she's just testifying -- actually, 17 the best evidence is the tape itself. So I think, in that 18 sense, we will object if they're just going to walk through 19 portions of the transcript and have her recite her 20 transcript. I mean, she wasn't there. 21 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Klein. I didn't mean 22 to talk over you. I did talk over you, so please finish 23 your thought. 24 MR. KLEIN: That was the end of my thought,

25

Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Proctor, do you wish to add anything?

MR. PROCTOR: Yeah. I'm happy to further explain the point of what I'm trying to make if Your Honor wants to hear it now; otherwise, I can ask very just summarized leading questions and walk through it quicker, if that's in the interest of everybody.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Proctor, I already received the audio. And to the extent that you wish to use the transcript during argument, you certainly could reference it. You all will have it before us, and I'll have the audio check the primary source on this. I don't think it's necessary, and in the interest of time, to have the agent just read what I can read myself.

MR. PROCTOR: All right, Your Honor. I'll just ask, then, my follow-up question. My summarizing final questions on this.

# BY MR. PROCTOR:

Q You've listened to it, and you prepared the transcript. Does Mr. Hutchins, in this transcript, discuss why he believes he was arrested?

I'll leave it there.

Does he identify why he believes he was arrested?

A Yes.

Q Does he summarize aspects of his interview with

1 the FBI? 2 Α Yes. 3 Does he speculate why the FBI decided to arrest 4 him at this point? 5 Α Yes. 6 At any point, does Mr. Hutchins complain about not 7 understanding what the FBI talked about during their 8 interview? 9 Α No. 10 At any time, does Mr. Hutchins complain about 11 being intoxicated? 12 Α No. 13 At any time, does Mr. Hutchins complain about 14 being impaired in any way? 15 Α No. 16 At any time, does Mr. Hutchins complain about the 17 FBI using threats or promises to get him to talk? 18 Α No. 19 During the call, does Mr. Hutchins come across as 20 lucid and coherent or something less? 21 Lucid and coherent. 22 Does he recall many details regarding his use of 23 computers and the origins of the case that ultimately led to 24 his arrest based on his memory? 25 Α Yes.

```
1
                 MR. PROCTOR: No further questions, Your Honor.
 2
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
 3
                 Mr. Klein.
 4
                 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
                 Your Honor, may I approach the lecturn?
 6
                 THE COURT: You may.
 7
                 MR. KLEIN: Do you mind if I move this so I can
 8
       get some of the exhibits because there's not a lot of space
       here to work with the exhibits.
 9
10
                 THE COURT: Help yourself, Mr. Klein.
11
                             CROSS-EXAMINATION
       BY MR. KLEIN:
12
13
                 Good afternoon, Special Agent. You've been with
14
       the FBI three years?
15
                 Almost nine.
                 Three years as a special agent?
16
17
            Α
                 Yes.
                 And as part of your training, you're trained on
18
19
       how to surveil people?
20
                 Yes.
21
                 You're trained how to arrest people?
22
                 Yes.
            Α
23
                 You're trained how to provide Miranda warnings?
24
            Α
                 Yes.
25
                 You're trained how to write reports?
```

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And as part of your training on writing reports,
3	you're tra	ained to write an accurate report, correct?
4	A	Yeah.
5	Q	A full report?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And if later you learn you need to fix in that
8	report, yo	ou actually are trained to write an additional
9	report, co	orrect?
10		You wouldn't go in and amend your report? You
11	would actu	ually write a supplemental report?
12	A	Right.
13	Q	You're also, part of your training, is how to
14	record int	cerviews?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And you are the case agent in this case, correct?
17	A	Correct.
18	Q	What does that mean?
19	A	That means I am the primary investigator in the
20	case.	
21	Q	So you're the lead agent?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	So Special Agent Chartier, was he working with you
24	or for you	ı, or what was your relationship with
25	А	He was working with me, yeah.

1	Q	Although he's technically your supervisor,
2	correct?	
3	А	No.
4	Q	Is he the head of the cyber unit?
5	А	No, he's a colleague.
6	Q	Did you meet with the prosecutors in advance of
7	today's t	estimony about your testimony?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	How many times?
LO	А	Once for this and once in the case prior that was
L1	postponed	1.
L2	Q	So that's back in mid-April?
L3	А	Yes.
L4	Q	And who did you meet with when you met with them?
L5	А	Both of them.
L6	Q	And was Special Agent Chartier with you?
L7	А	No. We were separate for most of the time.
L8	Q	And have you talked to him about your testimony
L9	today?	
20		After you met with him the first time, did you
21	talk to S	pecial Agent Chartier about your meeting with them?
22	А	Not about the specifics of our individual
23	testimony	r, no.
24	Q	Did you talk to him about anything with your
25	meetina w	rith the AUSAs?

1 We've been working on the case together. Α The case 2 in general, yes. 3 What about your prep meeting? The meeting where 4 you met with them to talk about your testimony, did you talk 5 to Special Agent Chartier about that? 6 Α Generally. 7 What did you tell him? 8 MR. CHMELAR: Objection. 9 MR. PROCTOR: I'm going to object, Your Honor, to 10 the relevance of this. There's nothing wrong with agents 11 meeting with prosecutors in advance. I'm not sure where 12 he's going with this. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Klein. 14 MR. KLEIN: I'm just trying to find out if they 15 talked about details of their meetings that maybe shared 16 things they wanted to talk about. 17 THE COURT: I'll allow it. I believe Mr. Klein is 18 probing to what extent the witness's testimonies are 19 independent of each other. So I'll allow it. 20 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question? 21 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 22 BY MR. KLEIN: 23 What did you talk about with Special Agent 24 Chartier about your prep meeting with the prosecutors? 25 Various things. I can't remember specifics.

1 Give me some big picture things you discussed with 2 them. 3 Just generally the interview and Miranda and just Α 4 making sure that we were on -- you know, that our facts were 5 the same. 6 So you were making sure your facts were the same? 7 You just said that, correct? 8 I did. 9 Okay. Did you review any documents in advance of 10 this meeting? 11 Of course. 12 What did you review? 13 The transcripts. The report from the interview 14 and all of the recordings. 15 When you say "all of the recordings," which 16 recordings are you referring to? 17 The post-arrest statement and both jail calls. 18 How many times did you listen to those? 19 Once this morning and once before when we were 20 originally scheduled. I listened to it several times while 21 I was writing the report, but that's been quite sometime. 22 And, again, with the jail calls, you weren't 0 23 listening in when those calls were being made, right? 24 Α No. 25 0 You got those later?

1		A	Yes.
2		Q	Nobody from the FBI was listening in those calls
3	when	they	were made, right?
4		A	No.
5		Q	Now, Mr. Hutchins was indicted in July 2017?
6		A	Yes.
7		Q	And you were the case agent at that time?
8		A	Yes.
9		Q	And you were the case agent leading up to his
10	indio	ctment	t?
11		A	Yes.
12		Q	There was an arrest warrant that was issued as
13	part	of h	is indictment; is that right?
14		A	Yes.
15		Q	And that arrest warrant was issued also in July?
16		A	Yes.
17			MR. KLEIN: One second, Your Honor.
18	BY MF	R. KLI	EIN:
19		Q	The indictment charges Mr. Hutchins and a
20	co-de	efenda	ant with a number of charges, correct?
21		A	Yes.
22		Q	And there's how many counts? Six counts?
23		A	I believe so.
24		Q	One second. I'm looking for the arrest warrant.
25			And you knew before he was indicted that he was a

```
1
       citizen of the United Kingdom, correct?
 2
            Α
                 Yes.
 3
                 MR. KLEIN: May I approach?
 4
                 THE COURT: You may.
 5
                 And you don't have to ask, Mr. Klein.
 6
                 MR. KLEIN: I forgot about that, Your Honor.
 7
       BY MR. KLEIN:
 8
                 So what I placed in front of you is the copy of
 9
       the -- one second. Sorry about this.
10
                 This arrest warrant, I ask you to turn your
11
       attention to it. Do you see it there?
12
                 Yes.
13
                 So it's an arrest warrant from the Eastern
14
       District of Wisconsin, correct?
15
            Α
                 Yes.
                 And it has Mr. Hutchins' name on it?
16
17
                 Yes.
                 As well as an alias?
18
19
                 Yeah.
20
                 At the bottom of it, it has your signature?
            0
21
                 No. That's Special Agent Chartier's.
22
                 Okay. So he signed it, not you, even though
23
       you're the case agent?
24
                 Yes, because he actually took Mr. Hutchins into
25
       custody.
```

```
1
                         And it has the date Mr. Hutchins was taken
            0
                  Okay.
 2
       into custody?
 3
            Α
                  Yes.
                 And that is August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017?
 4
 5
            Α
                 Yes.
 6
                 Does it list all the charges Mr. Hutchins is
 7
       charged with?
 8
            Α
                 No.
 9
                  What does it say in terms of charges?
10
                 Conspiracy to defraud the United States.
            Α
11
                  So it doesn't mention any of the other charges,
            Q
       right?
12
13
            Α
                 No.
14
                 And it mentions there's an indictment?
15
            Α
                 Yes.
16
                  Now, turning your attention back to the events of
17
       late July and August 2017. You knew Mr. Hutchins was coming
18
       to Defcon before he arrived, correct?
19
            Α
                  Correct.
20
                  And you knew that he was flying from the United
21
       Kingdom?
22
            Α
                  Yes.
23
                 And at that time, you had an arrest warrant for
24
       him, right?
25
            Α
                  Yes.
```

1	Q And you had an indictment?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And when he landed, was he arrested?
4	A No.
5	Q He wasn't arrested? I'm talking about in
6	Las Vegas.
7	A Yeah.
8	Q How long was he in Las Vegas for before you
9	arrested him? Do you recall?
10	A Approximately a week.
11	Q Did you seek to arrest him any point prior to the
12	day he was arrested?
13	A No.
14	Q So the first time you tried to arrest him was that
15	time at the airport when he was arrested?
16	MR. PROCTOR: Object to the relevance of this
17	questioning, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Klein.
19	MR. KLEIN: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Do you want to answer the objection?
21	MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. I think we're just
22	trying to show that they had the opportunity to arrest him,
23	and they waited until a precise moment. And we'll get to
24	that in our argument of why that moment is important.
25	THE COURT: I'll allow it.

## 1 BY MR. KLEIN: 2 In advance of his coming to the U.S., you were 3 aware that he had been to the U.S. once before, correct? 4 Correct. 5 0 And that was a few years before? 6 Α I believe it was the year prior. 7 It was also for Defcon? 8 Yes. And you know what Defcon is, right? 9 10 Α Yes. 11 What is it? A conference for hackers and security 12 13 professionals. 14 And it's known for its parties, right? 15 I suppose. I've never been. 16 You've been to Vegas, though, right? 17 Once before the arrest, yes. 18 Vegas is known for its parties, correct? Q 19 Yes. 20 You didn't seek to arrest him before he got to the 21 U.S., did you? 22 We intended to. 23 Before he got to the U.S.? 24 No, when he first arrived in the U.S. 25 concerns that were expressed by the organization because of

1 the sinkhole for WannaCry; therefore, the arrest was delayed 2 until his departure. 3 But you could've arrested him before? 4 We could have. 5 Now, I want to turn your attention to the events 6 of the day of his arrest. You arrived the day before his 7 arrest in Las Vegas, correct? 8 Α Yes. 9 And when you arrived, you came with Special Agent 10 Chartier. I might be mispronouncing his name. 11 Α Yes. 12 It was just you two from the Milwaukee field 13 office? 14 No. Our colleague, Elliot Mustell, was also with Α 15 us. 16 You all flew out together? 17 Mr. Mustell flew out at a later time in the Α 18 day, and we picked him up at the airport. 19 Is he in the cyber unit too? 20 He is. 21 And did you meet with other FBI agents here once 22 you landed? 23 Yes. And you planned for his arrest the following day? 24 0 25 Α Yes.

```
1
                 So you stayed here in Las Vegas that night.
            0
 2
       next morning you got ready to arrest him, correct?
 3
            Α
                 Yes.
 4
                 Were you part of the surveillance team that
 5
       started surveilling him starting at 6 in the morning?
 6
            Α
                 No.
 7
                 Did you just go directly to the airport that
 8
       morning?
 9
            Α
                 Yes.
10
                 What time did you arrive at the airport?
11
                 I want to say around 10. I don't know the
            Α
       specifics, but it was early.
12
13
                 Before Mr. Hutchins got there?
14
                 Significantly, yeah.
            Α
                 And you were with Special Agent Chartier?
15
16
                 Yes.
17
                 Were you with the other special agent you just
       mentioned?
18
19
            Α
                 Yes.
                 Now, I want to have you direct your attention to
20
21
       this surveillance log. Do you have it in front of you now?
22
                 Yes.
            Α
23
                 It's five pages, correct?
24
            Α
                 Yes.
25
            Q
                 Did you prepare this log?
```

1	А	No.
2	Q	Who did?
3	A	The agents that conducted the surveillance. The
4	Las Vegas	agents.
5	Q	Okay. So you worked with a team of Las Vegas
6	agents tha	at morning?
7	A	Yes. I did not meet the surveillance team at any
8	point.	
9	Q	Okay. But you knew he was being surveiled?
10	A	For the morning, yes.
11	Q	Okay. So I'm going to direct your attention to
12	page 3.	
13		Your Honor, I'm not sure you have a copy.
14		THE COURT: I do not.
15		MR. KLEIN: Let me bring a copy up.
16		THE COURT: Thank you.
17	BY MR. KLI	EIN:
18	Q	So I direct your attention back to page 3. Are
19	you there?	?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	So this describes when the surveillance first
22	started to	surveil Mr. Hutchins that morning, correct?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And so these times here would be accurate? You
25	would rely	on these as an FBI agent, right?

```
1
            Α
                 Yes.
 2
                 And so I guess surveillance picked up at
 3
       6:44 a.m.?
 4
            Α
                 Yes.
 5
                 And then the agents followed him and observed food
 6
       being delivered?
 7
                 Uh-huh.
            Α
 8
                 And they observed him leaving for the airport?
 9
            Α
                 Yeah.
10
                 If you turn over to page 4, do you see that he
11
       arrived at the Las Vegas airport at 12:18 p.m.?
12
            Α
                 Yes.
13
                 And next he went through the ticket counter.
14
       you see that?
15
            Α
                 Yes.
16
                 And security?
17
            Α
                 Yes.
18
                 Now, Mr. Hutchins wasn't arrested when he arrived
19
       at the airport, right?
20
                 No.
21
                 And he did go through security, correct?
            Q
22
                 Yes.
            Α
23
                 And he wasn't arrested right after he went through
24
       security, was he?
25
            Α
                 No.
```

1	Q So he cleared TSA at 12:41 p.m. Do you see that
2	on page 4?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And then he went into the club?
5	A Yes.
6	Q That's not like a music club. It's an airport
7	club, right?
8	A Yes.
9	Q And where were you at this point?
10	A I was in the secure area of the airport.
11	Q And were you in contact with the agent surveilling
12	him?
13	A They made contact with us once he had arrived at
14	the airport, yes, and then once he was in the lounge.
15	Q And how did they make contact with you?
16	A I believe they contacted the airport agent, the
17	Las Vegas agent that was there.
18	Q So you were in a room with Special Agent Chartier
19	and you and some sort of agent from the airport?
20	A A special agent from the FBI, the Las Vegas
21	office. He was assigned to the airport, yes.
22	Q Okay. Was someone from Customs and Border Patrol
23	in the room with you?
24	A I'm not sure if they were at that time or not.
25	Q When did Mr. Chartier head upstairs to effectuate

1 the arrest of Mr. Hutchins? 2 He went when Mr. Hutchins was in the lounge 3 because there was concern that Mr. Hutchins might start 4 drinking, and that would be of concern to us. 5 So he went at 12:49 p.m., because that's when it's 6 noted? 7 Uh-huh. Α 8 And then you'll see at the bottom, at 1:17, 9 Mr. Hutchins was escorted out by Customs and Border Patrol? 10 Α Yes. 11 And that would've been when he was with Mr. Chartier? 12 13 Α Correct. 14 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would actually offer 15 this exhibit into evidence. I would mark it as Exhibit --16 I'm not sure what number. I can start with A if you want to 17 do defense exhibits differently or if you want to 18 sequentially go up. 19 THE COURT: It's always easier to sequentially go 20 What was the last one? up. 21 THE CLERK: They're out of order anyway. THE COURT: Yeah. The last one I have is Exhibit 22 23 11. 24 MR. KLEIN: That's what I have too. So maybe 25 we'll make this Exhibit 12.

```
1
                 THE COURT: Let's do that.
 2
                 Mr. Proctor, do you have any objection? You're
 3
       raising your hand. Do you have an Exhibit 12?
 4
                 MR. PROCTOR:
                               No. We don't have --
 5
                 MR. CHMELAR: We went out of order as well, Judge.
 6
       We labeled our exhibits and then decided against some and
 7
       introduced others.
 8
                 THE COURT: Okay. We'll call this Exhibit 12.
 9
                 Any objection to the receipt of Exhibit 12, the
10
       surveillance log?
11
                 MR. CHMELAR: No, Judge.
12
                 THE COURT: It's received.
13
                 MR. KLEIN: Thank you.
14
                 Your Honor, may I approach with the arrest
15
       warrant? I want to offer that into evidence as well.
16
                 THE COURT: You may.
17
                 MR. KLEIN: And I meant to approach you, not the
18
       witness.
19
                 THE COURT: We're going to call that Exhibit 13.
20
                 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we offer Exhibit 13 into
21
       evidence too.
22
                 THE COURT: Any objection to the receipt of the
23
       warrant, Exhibit 13?
24
                 MR. PROCTOR: No objection.
25
       ///
```

## 1 BY MR. KLEIN: 2 When you were there that day down in the room with 3 Special Agent Chartier and the FBI airport liaison or agent, 4 you were in, you said, casual clothes, or business casual? 5 Α Yes. 6 Special Agent Chartier was too? 7 Α Yes. 8 You didn't have the FBI jackets on you? 9 Α No. 10 The kind you use to effectuate an arrest usually? Q 11 Α No. 12 Neither did Special Agent Chartier? 13 Α No. 14 You did have your badge on you, though? Q 15 Α Yes. 16 And a weapon? 17 Α Yes. 18 And Special Agent Chartier had his FBI badge? Q 19 Yes. 20 And his weapon? 0 21 Α Yes. 22 So at 1:17, Mr. Hutchins was arrested by CBP and 23 Special Agent Chartier? 24 Α Correct. 25 And at some point, they appear down in your room,

1 or did you go up and meet them? 2 No, they came down. 3 Okay. Between the time they came down and came to 4 you, you don't know what happened? 5 As far as I know, they walked down to the 6 area. 7 So when they arrive, it's -- who's coming to the 8 room first when you were there? 9 When Mr. Hutchins appears in the room, who is with 10 him? 11 Agent Chartier and the CBP officer. Okay. And where is the FBI liaison officer? 12 13 I don't know if he was in the room or not at that 14 time. 15 What is his or her name? 16 Nick. 17 Nick. Do you remember the last name? 18 No, but I could find it. Α 19 Okay. We may ask you to do that. 20 So I want to direct your attention -- Special 21 Agent Chartier had some concern about -- let me go back. 22 The original plan was to arrest Mr. Hutchins as he 23 was about to board the plane, correct? 24 Α Yes. 25 You weren't originally intending to arrest him in

1	the loung	ge?
2	А	No.
3	Q	And the only reason the FBI chose to arrest him
4	was becau	use they thought he ordered an alcoholic beverage?
5	А	Correct.
6	Q	So that was a concern to you if he had had a
7	drink?	
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	And the concern was if he had been drinking, you
10	may not k	be able to interview him right away, correct?
11	А	Yes. It's less reliable.
12	Q	So if someone is drinking even one drink, it's
13	less reli	able?
14	А	Probably.
15	Q	Now, I'm going to direct your attention
16		Your Honor, may I approach and provide this to you
17	also?	
18		THE COURT: Yes. And you don't have to ask,
19	Mr. Kleir	ı.
20	BY MR. KI	EIN:
21	Q	Now, as the case agent, part of your duty would be
22	to draft	memos capturing what's happening during the case,
23	right?	
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	And I think those are commonly referred to

1 often referred to as 302s? 2 Α Yes. 3 Do you understand that terminology? 4 Α Yes. 5 And so in this case, I direct your attention to 6 the 302 I placed in front of you. This is the 302 you drafted following Mr. Hutchins' arrest, right? 7 8 Correct. 9 And it's dated. Do you see the top, date of entry 10 is August 11, 2017? 11 That's when it was signed off, correct. Okay. And the date drafted is August 7. Is that 12 13 on the bottom? Do you see on the right? 14 Yes. Α 15 Okay. So that's the date you drafted it? 16 I began drafting it, yes. 17 And when you say "signed off," what do you mean "signed off"? 18 19 That it was approved by the supervisor and 20 serialized to the case file. 21 And who is that supervisor? 22 Α SA John May. 23 And I would ask you to look through it. quite a lengthy 302. It's eight pages, right? 24 25 Α Yes.

1	Q	And you prepared this 302 five days after the
2	arrest?	
3	А	I began it as soon as we returned to Milwaukee.
4	Q	When did you return to Milwaukee?
5	А	For business, on the $7^{th}$ . It was the weekend when
6	we return	ed.
7	Q	So you returned to Milwaukee on the 7 <sup>th</sup> ?
8	А	I returned to Milwaukee at 1:00 a.m. on the 5 <sup>th</sup> ,
9	on Saturd	ay.
10	Q	So is that the night of the $4^{th}$ or the morning of
11	the 5 <sup>th</sup> ?	Or is that the next
12	А	We departed from Las Vegas the evening of the 4 <sup>th</sup>
13	and arriv	ed back in Milwaukee at 1:00 a.m. on the 5 <sup>th</sup> , on a
14	Saturday.	
15	Q	And so you went into the office that Saturday and
16	started t	o prepare notes?
17	А	No. I went into the office on Monday, the first
18	business	day after we returned.
19	Q	So you didn't prepare this in Las Vegas?
20	А	No.
21	Q	And this report appears to be it's a largely
22	let me st	ep back.
23		You had partially recorded the interview with
24	Mr. Hutch	ins, correct?
25	A	Yes.

1 And this report is -- you listened to the 0 2 recording when you prepared this report? 3 Α Yes. 4 And you meant to capture what he said on the 5 recording? 6 It's meant to be a summary, correct. Α 7 So turning to the top of this -- I want to look at 0 8 page 1. Turning to the very top. 9 Α Okay. 10 It's blacked out for some reason, but it 11 mentions -- there's an opening paragraph, right? Marcus 12 Hutchins, date of --13 Date of birth, yeah. 14 Date of birth. Was interviewed at McCarran 15 International Airport, Las Vegas, Nevada? 16 Correct. 17 And then it states, "After being advised of the 18 identity of the interviewing agents" --19 Α Yes. 20 And that would be you and Special Agent Chartier? 0 21 Correct. Α 22 The nature of the interview and being advised of 0 23 his rights? 24 Α Yes. 25 And by that you meant the Miranda waiver? 0

1	A Yes.
2	Q And the 1001 waiver?
3	A Yes, but that doesn't count as an Advice of
4	Rights. That's just legal yeah, false statements.
5	Q Okay. So by that you're referring to
6	A The Miranda warning specifically.
7	Q Which is marked as Exhibit 9?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do you have a copy of that in front of you?
10	A Not anymore, no.
11	Q Okay. Let me bring you a copy. I'll make sure I
12	also have a copy.
13	So you have Exhibit 9 in front of you?
14	A Yes.
15	MR. KLEIN: And, Your Honor, you have a copy of
16	that, correct?
17	THE COURT: I do.
18	BY MR. KLEIN:
19	Q So when you refer he was advised of his rights,
20	you're referring to this?
21	A Correct.
22	Q Your opening paragraph doesn't mention whether he
23	waived those rights, does it?
24	A No.
25	Q Okay. And this form that I'm asking you to look

1 at --It's implied. If he provided the information --2 Α 3 I'm just asking you to answer my questions now. 4 Α Okay. 5 0 It doesn't mention that he waived his rights, does 6 it? 7 Α No. 8 So turning to the form, do you see it? 9 Α Yes. 10 Do you see your signature at the bottom of it? Q 11 I do. Α When did you sign this? 12 13 After Mr. Hutchins signed it. Α 14 Okay. And do you see another signature there? Q 15 Yes. Α 16 Whose signature is that? 17 Special Agent Chartier's. 18 Okay. So is it meant to be signed by whoever is Q 19 there present for this part of the interview? 20 Correct. 21 The form, as it was signed that day -- this is not 0 22 the exact form that was signed that day, is it? 23 This is a copy, not the original. 24 When Mr. Hutchins signed this form, right? 0 25 Α Yes.

1 Right after he signed it, you signed it? 0 2 Α Yes. 3 Special Agent Chartier? 4 Α Yes. 5 0 Was the place filled in? 6 Α No. 7 Was the date filled in? 8 No. 9 Was the time filled in? 10 No. Α 11 And I'm talking about the time both at the top and the bottom. 12 13 Correct. 14 And so you mentioned earlier that you felt like 15 you didn't have time at that point to fill it in, correct? 16 Yes. I felt like the interview was progressing, 17 and I needed to focus on that. 18 And you actually filled this in later, sent five days later on August 7<sup>th</sup>? 19 I'm uncertain of which time I filled out the form. 20 21 I think it was while I was still in Vegas. 22 You're not certain? 0 23 The original information. 24 Do you recall meeting with the prosecutors on April 18<sup>th</sup> to prepare for the original set hearing here? 25

1 Α Yes. 2 And do you recall telling them that you realized 3 you had incorrectly filled out this form, and that when you 4 were drafting your 302, you attempted to reconstruct the 5 time? 6 Α Correct. 7 Okay. So you didn't start drafting your 302 until August 7<sup>th</sup>? 8 9 Α Correct. 10 That's not in Vegas, is it? 11 Α No. 12 Okay. So you didn't start to fill out the time, 13 or fill in these other portions until you got home to 14 Milwaukee, correct? 15 I filled out the location and the original No. 16 time while I was still in Vegas. 17 When you say the original time, what are you 18 referring to? 19 The 11:08 time, that was incorrect. 20 So you filled out -- in Vegas, you filled --21 you're saying you filled out at McCarran International 22 Airport? 23 Α Yes. 24 And you filled out 11:08 a.m.? 0 25 Α Yes.

1 And 11:08 at the bottom? 0 2 Α Yes. 3 And then when you got home to Milwaukee is when 4 you altered the form? 5 Α Yes. 6 So the form that Mr. Hutchins saw didn't include 7 that information, did it? 8 Not the time or the location, no. 9 And you don't recall when in Las Vegas you 10 bothered to fill it in at the airport and the original time? 11 I don't. There was a lot happening. Α 12 Well, after Mr. Hutchins left the interview room, 13 you were done speaking to him, correct? 14 Α Incorrect. We transported him to Henderson 15 Detention Center, and there was a lot of --16 But you had time. You could've filled out this 17 form during that day? 18 It was a long day. 19 How long do you think it takes to fill out a time? 20 Not very long. Α 21 Okay. But you didn't do it that day, did you? Q 22 I may have done it that evening or the next day. Α 23 And then when you get back to Milwaukee five days 24 later, you altered this form? 25 Correct.

```
And you alter it twice, actually, right?
 1
            0
 2
                 I realized it was incorrect, yes.
            Α
 3
                 So you first put down "2:08 p.m."?
            Q
 4
            Α
                 Yes.
 5
                 Then you crossed that off?
 6
            Α
                 Yes.
 7
                 Did you immediately -- actually, you first crossed
 8
       off the "11:08 a.m.," right?
 9
            Α
                 Yes.
10
                 Then you fill in "2:08," and you put a squiggly
11
       line, which you mean by approximation?
12
            Α
                 Yes.
13
                 By that you mean within 10 minutes?
14
                 Within the general time frame, yes.
            Α
15
                 What do you mean by the general time frame?
            Q
16
                 That it's not a specific time. It's approximate.
17
                 Okay. Times are important, correct?
            Q
18
                 Yes.
            Α
19
                 And when you look at the log, they don't put in a
20
       squiggly line and approximation, do they?
21
                 When I look at what?
            Α
                 When you look at the surveillance log -- turn your
22
23
       attention back to that.
24
            Α
                 Yes.
25
            Q
                 Are there approximations of time?
```

1 No, there are not. 2 Okay. And you're actually trained not to put --3 the time this happened is important, correct? 4 Α Yes. 5 And the time you originally put in didn't have a 6 squiggly line? 7 Α Correct. 8 And so you then cross out the 2:08 at the top of 9 the form, and then you fill in 1:18? 10 Α Correct. 11 And you don't change that time? No. It's approximate, and I believe it to be 12 13 within 10 or 15 minutes of when the Miranda rights were 14 given. 15 You recognize that when Miranda rights are given 16 is important, don't you? 17 Α Yes. 18 And they need to be given before someone is 19 interviewed, correct? 20 Of course. 21 So this time when this happens is very important, 22 isn't it? 23 Α Yes. 24 Now, you didn't note anywhere in -- I direct your 25 attention back to your 302. There's no notation in here

1 that you altered this form, is there? 2 Α No. 3 Okay. There's no notation, in fact, about when 4 the interview started, is there? 5 No. I have not done that in the past. 6 Are you aware that FBI guidance on recording 7 interviews is to include the time of interviews? 8 I was not until I was informed today. 9 Who informed you of that today? 10 Α Mr. Proctor. 11 What did he tell you? He showed me the guidance that you had provided in 12 13 your submission to the Court. 14 And what did he tell you? 15 He just showed me the guidance. 16 He just showed it you and didn't say anything? 17 I don't recall. He just mentioned that that would Α 18 be something that you may ask about. 19 And did you read the guidance? 20 I did. 21 And did he ask you if you had known about the quidance beforehand? 22 23 No. 24 He didn't ask you any questions about the 25 quidance?

1 It's an internal policy. That's not something 2 that I have --3 My question is: Did he ask you anything about the Q 4 guidance, not whether it's a policy? 5 Α No. 6 Did he talk to you about other questions you might 7 be asked today? 8 MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, I'm going to object to 9 this. Preparation between counsel and agents, those 10 specific things, that's not relevant whether or not 11 Mr. Hutchins voluntarily waived his Miranda rights. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Klein. 13 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'm just focusing in on 14 the fact about how she got to this point where she now 15 understands this policy, which she apparently didn't 16 understand before and actually is an important policy 17 because she's noted that when you record an in-custody 18 suspect or defendant, the FBI quidance says you're supposed 19 to put the time in the 302, and she didn't do that. 20 THE COURT: You made your point, Mr. Klein. 21 I'll allow you to -- you could ask a question to wrap it up, 22 and let's move on. 23 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. I'll just move on 24 now. 25 THE COURT: Thank you.

1	BY MR. KLI	EIN:
2	Q	So, Special Agent, you also wrote another 302
3	about that	day of the arrest, correct?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And that was about when you were transporting
6	Mr. Hutch:	ins to the Henderson facility?
7	A	Do you mean from the facility to processing the
8	next day?	
9	Q	Yes. I think it was
10	A	There are several.
11	Q	Yes, that sounds right to me.
12		And so you did another 302, right?
13	A	Correct.
14	Q	And was that written around the same time as this
15	one?	
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	In that report, you didn't note that you had
18	altered th	ne time on this form, did you?
19	A	No. The form had nothing to do with that
20	instance.	
21	Q	At some point, about a month after this happened,
22	you spoke	with Special Agent Chartier about this form,
23	didn't you	1?
24	A	About?
25	Q	About this form, the Advice of Rights form.

1 Α I'm uncertain. I'm not sure what you're asking. 2 Well, did you ever tell anybody in the FBI last 0 3 year that you had changed the times in this form? 4 Yes, because they were incorrect. 5 Q Who did you tell? 6 Α I probably told several people. 7 0 Do you remember if you told Special Agent 8 Chartier? 9 Α I most likely did, yes. 10 You wrote a 302 in December of last year, about, 0 11 and questioned that -- you claim Mr. Chartier asked Marcus 12 Hutchins, correct? 13 Α Correct. 14 And that was a supplemental 302? 15 It was. 16 And you were directed to write that by the 17 prosecutors? 18 It was unclear from the original reports that those issues had been addressed; so, yes. 19 20 And so you wrote that supplemental report? 21 I did. And you didn't include in that report that you had 22 23 changed the times, did you? 24 Α No. 25 Q Okay. And you have not written a supplemental

1 report so far to note that you changed the times? 2 The times being changed --3 I'm just asking a question. Have you written 4 a supplement? 5 Α No, but they should be apparent. 6 MR. PROCTOR: Your Honor, I ask that she be 7 allowed to answer the question. 8 THE COURT: If we can speak one at a time both for 9 the benefit of the recording and also our court reporter. 10 Yes, one person at a time, please. 11 Mr. Klein, you can continue, please. 12 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. 13 BY MR. KLEIN: 14 The first time that you mentioned this altering of 15 the times to the prosecutors was when you met with them back 16 in April? 17 I don't believe so. They had the form in advance 18 of that. You told them before April 18<sup>th</sup> that you had 19 20 altered this form? 21 Yeah, they were aware of it. They had the form in 22 their possession. 23 So you said "I've altered this form" to them? 24 Yes. And they knew before April 18<sup>th</sup>? 25

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And did you tell them anything else about that?
3	А	That I had put a time originally. And then when I
4	went to w	rite my report, I realized it was incorrect and
5	sought to	correct it.
6	Q	When you were down in the interview with
7	Mr. Hutch	ins, you didn't ask him if he had been drinking,
8	did you?	
9	А	I did not. Agent Chartier did.
10	Q	You didn't ask your own independent question,
11	correct?	
12	А	No.
13	Q	You didn't ask him if he had done any drugs that
14	day?	
15	А	I did not.
16	Q	You didn't ask him if he was exhausted?
17	А	No. Agent Chartier had asked if he was
18	Q	I just asked if you had asked if he was exhausted.
19	А	Okay.
20	Q	As part of the arrest of Mr. Hutchins, because
21	he's a Un	ited Kingdom citizen, you had to notify his
22	embassy?	
23	А	Correct.
24	Q	And that's standard FBI practice?
25	А	Yeah.

```
1
                 When anyone from a foreign country is arrested,
 2
       you notify their embassy?
 3
            Α
                 Yes.
 4
                 And agent -- is it Mustell?
 5
            Α
                 Mustell.
 6
                 He prepared that form?
 7
            Α
                 Yes.
 8
                 And he called at 1:26 to notify them?
 9
            Α
                 Correct.
10
                 And that was after he was arrested?
11
            Α
                 Yes.
                 How did Mustell know to call at 1:26? Where was
12
13
       Mustell?
14
            Α
                 He was just outside the interview room in the
15
       lobby area of the secure space.
16
                 Okay. And after the arrest, you and Special Agent
17
       Chartier interrogated Marcus in that room, correct?
18
                 Interviewed, yes.
            Α
19
                 And that lasted about an hour and 40 minutes?
20
            Α
                 Approximately.
21
                 And you took notes, too, during your interview?
            Q
22
                 I did.
23
                 And you take notes because you may rely on them to
       write your 302?
24
25
                 And it's a good way to review what was discussed
```

1 before you have the ability to review the recording. 2 And those notes don't reflect the time you 3 provided the Miranda warnings, do they? 4 Α No. They don't mention Miranda warnings, do they? 5 0 6 No, because it's standard for custodial --Α 7 I'm just asking you if they mention it. 8 Α No. 9 You had originally planned to tape the interview 10 using sort of the room's audio recording system? 11 That's our standard procedure. Α Yes. 12 And that didn't work that day? 13 Α No. 14 Had you brought a recording with you? Q 15 Yes, for backup. Α 16 So you knew before the interview started that you 17 would need to turn on your audio recorder? 18 Α Yes. You didn't start it when Mr. Hutchins first 19 20 arrived in the room, did you? 21 Α No. 22 In fact, you started it mid-stream of what was 0 23 going on? When substantive questioning began, yes. 24 Α 25 0 But you started after you claim he was shown the

1 Miranda warnings? 2 Α Yes. 3 And signed them? 4 Yes. 5 Okay. I want to back up to what happens. 6 walks into the room, right? And that's when Chartier asked 7 him if he had been drinking? 8 I'm not certain whether it was before or 9 after Miranda, but it was before questioning began. 10 And then when you show him when he walks in the 11 room, it is the Miranda warnings? 12 Agent Chartier did, yes. 13 And the 1001 waiver? 0 14 Yes. Α 15 And then you start the interview? 16 Yes. 17 Okay. Soon after the interview starts, you 0 18 realize you haven't pressed record on your button? 19 Α Correct. 20 And you press it? 21 Α Yes. 22 And when you press record, you don't know anywhere 23 on that auto recording that Mr. Hutchins has been advised of 24 his rights, do you? 25 Α No.

```
1
                 You don't know that you had -- the system had
 2
       failed, the internal taping system, do you?
 3
            Α
                 No.
 4
                 You don't note that you started this audio
 5
       recording mid-stream, do you?
 6
            Α
                 No.
 7
                 You just press play, and it goes to the end?
 8
                 Correct.
 9
                 I want to turn your attention to that moment when
10
       you first pressed play.
11
                 You recall that almost within 30 seconds after you
       pressed play, Mr. Hutchins asked you, "What is this about"?
12
13
                 MR. PROCTOR: I'm going to object and clarify.
14
                 You mean press record?
15
                 MR. KLEIN: Press record.
16
       BY MR. KLEIN:
17
                 You recall that within 30 seconds after you press
       record, Mr. Hutchins asked, "What is this about"?
18
19
                 I believe so.
20
                 And your response is, "We're going to get to it.
21
       Did you have a good week"?
22
                 Yeah. But Agent --
            Α
23
                 I'm just asking you if that's your response?
24
            Α
                 Yes.
25
            0
                 And you recall that it was about -- and I'll use
```

1 an approximation because I know you might not remember this. 2 It was about over an hour into this where Special Agent 3 Chartier showed Mr. Hutchins the arrest warrant? 4 I believe so. 5 MR. KLEIN: One moment, Your Honor. 6 BY MR. KLEIN: 7 0 You didn't show Mr. Hutchins his indictment during 8 this interview, did you? 9 Α No. 10 And you first showed him the arrest warrant at 11 that point of over an hour into the interview, correct? 12 Correct. 13 MR. KLEIN: One moment, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Take your time. 15 BY MR. KLEIN: 16 That day was the first day you had ever met 17 Mr. Hutchins, correct? 18 Α Correct. 19 So you've never met him in person before? 20 No. 21 You had never even seen him before in person, 0 22 correct? 23 Α No. 24 So any sort of judgment you make about how he 25 behaved would be based on that sole experience, correct?

1 Α Correct. 2 So you don't know how he is regularly. You're 3 just basing it on that one moment? 4 Α Yes. 5 MR. KLEIN: One quick second, Your Honor. 6 Your Honor, nothing further. 7 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Klein. 8 Mr. Proctor, anything further? 9 MR. PROCTOR: One second, Your Honor. 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. PROCTOR: 12 Mr. Klein asked you about the surveillance logs 13 and the times on those logs regarding when Mr. Hutchins was 14 observed in the airport going to the lounge. Do you recall 15 that? 16 Yes. 17 Was the FBI in a position to arrest him 18 immediately when he walked into that lounge, or did they 19 have to go from somewhere else? 20 We had to -- well, Agent Chartier and the CBP 21 officer had to come up from the secure area, which the 22 airport is rather large. So it would've taken some time to 23 get up there. It would've taken awhile? 24 25 Α Yeah.

```
1
                 Mr. Klein asked you several times writing or not
 2
       writing 302s regarding the changes to the form, Exhibit 9.
 3
       Do you recall that?
 4
                 Yes.
 5
                 Do you think it's self-evident from that form that
 6
       it's been changed?
 7
            Α
                 Yes.
 8
                 Would that kind of negate the need to write a 302
 9
       saying you changed the form?
10
            Α
                 In my opinion, yes.
11
                 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, I object to this.
12
                 THE COURT: Excuse me. One person at a time.
13
                 Mr. Proctor, you were talking while the witness
14
       was also talking. Or the witness was talking while you were
       still asking your question. I think that's what happened.
15
16
       And then objection jumped in.
17
                 Mr. Klein, your objection.
18
                 MR. KLEIN: I think these are leading questions
19
       and calling for speculation.
20
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Proctor, you may rephrase
21
       your question.
22
                 Witness, if you'll please wait for the question
23
      before you jump in.
24
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
25
       ///
```

1	BY MR. PROCTOR:	
2	Q	Did you erase times on Exhibit 9?
3	А	No.
4	Q	How did you indicate that the time has been
5	altered?	
6	А	I crossed it out with one line, so it was clear
7	that it w	as altered.
8	Q	Would you see a point in writing a 302 to
9	dedicate,	to memorialize that change?
10	А	No.
11	Q	Towards the end of his questioning, Mr. Klein
12	asked you	if you had ever seen Mr. Hutchins outside of that
13	interview. Do you recall that?	
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Have you seen Mr. Hutchins in other contexts after
16	that interview?	
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	So you've had time to observe him; is that
19	correct?	
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	Is he in court today?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Were you able to observe him right now?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Were you able to hear him speak on other occasions

1 than that interview? 2 Since the interview, yes. 3 Does that change any of your testimony regarding 0 4 your observations that he was clear and lucid during the 5 interview? 6 Α No. 7 MR. PROCTOR: One second, Your Honor. 8 BY MR. PROCTOR: 9 The next day, after Mr. Hutchins had been placed 10 at Henderson Correctional Facility, did you have any 11 interactions with him at that point as well? 12 Yes. 13 And can you describe that interaction? 14 We picked Mr. Hutchins up for a transport for 15 processing through FBI systems and to drop him off at the 16 U.S. marshals that day. Some suspicious activity had 17 happened overnight, so we did ask him about that at the time 18 of transport. 19 So you had a conversation with him? 20 Yes. 21 MR. PROCTOR: Nothing further, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Klein, anything further from you? 23 MR. KLEIN: Very brief, Your Honor. 24

## 1 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. KLEIN: 3 When Mr. Hutchins waived -- to sign that form is 4 important, correct? 5 Α Yes. 6 And the FBI could have arrested Mr. Hutchins the 7 moment he walked into the airport, correct? 8 Α Yes. 9 0 You could've arrested him at the lounge, correct? 10 Yes. Α 11 You did arrest him at the lounge? 12 Α Yes. 13 MR. KLEIN: Nothing further. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Klein. 15 **EXAMINATION** 16 BY THE COURT: 17 Agent Butcher, Exhibit 9 is still in front of you? 18 Α Yes. 19 Okay. That's the Miranda form. So the 20 original -- I guess the first number, the first time, the 21 11:08, what's the source of that time? I can't recall, Judge. I'm very sorry. 22 23 And then the approximately 2:08, what's the source of that time? 24 25 I believe it was based on time changes, but I also

```
The one that I find to be most accurate is
 1
       can't recall.
 2
       the 1:18 because I had all the source documents of the other
 3
       times available.
 4
                 And what's the source of the -- I think you
 5
       testified to that, but if you can kind of wrap it up for me.
 6
       What's the source of the approximate 1:18?
 7
                 So the notification to the consulate, the times on
            Α
 8
       that, the surveillance logs, the time of the recording
 9
       beginning, all of those things combined.
10
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
11
                 Anything specifically from the questions that I
12
       asked Agent Butcher.
13
                 Mr. Proctor?
14
                 MR. PROCTOR: No, Judge.
15
                 THE COURT: Mr. Klein?
16
                 MR. KLEIN: No, Your Honor.
17
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You may step down.
18
                 Any further witnesses from the Government?
19
                 MR. PROCTOR: No, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: At this time, is the Government
20
21
       resting then?
22
                 MR. PROCTOR: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: Mr. Klein?
                 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, can we have a moment to
24
25
       decide? We have a couple of decisions to make.
```

1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 MR. KLEIN: We'll probably need a break. 3 THE COURT: Let's take a break. Let our court 4 reporter stretch his back, too. 5 (Break.) 6 THE COURT: Mr. Klein. 7 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: How do you wish to proceed? 9 MR. KLEIN: We wish to call assistant United 10 States attorney Michael Chmelar or Benjamin Proctor. 11 THE COURT: And may I have a proffer? 12 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. There's two points 13 we want to have them testify about. The first relates to 14 Special Agent Chartier's testimony. On April 18<sup>th</sup> of this year, we received a 15 16 disclosure from them about what Special Agent Chartier told 17 them. And in that disclosure, he doesn't mention two facts 18 that have become very important to this hearing. One, that 19 he -- and what he testified here today is that he communicated the fact of an arrest warrant in the stairwell 20 21 to Mr. Hutchins. 22 MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I would only ask one thing as 23 Mr. Klein is making his proffer, that he avoid using 24 pronouns like "he" because there's multiple people he's

25

referring to.

You've asked him to be specific.

THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Klein, be specific, please.

MR. KLEIN: Sure. So Special Agent Chartier -- let me step back.

So there's two parts to what he testified to today that are inconsistent with what he told the prosecutors in a meeting before today. The first part is -- and he only met with those prosecutors. There are no other witnesses in the room. We established that through Special Agent Butcher, which is that each met with the prosecutors separately. So the only two we could call would be these two prosecutors.

So the first part is that today, Special Agent
Chartier -- and this is, in substance, testified that when
he and the two CBP officers arrested Mr. Hutchins, they
brought him into a stairwell, and that Special Agent
Chartier informed him that he was under arrest but also of
the fact that there was an arrest warrant.

And then later he testified today that when they were downstairs in the interrogation room and before the interview was being recorded, but during the process of showing him the Miranda, Mr. Hutchins, the Advice of Rights form, they showed -- Special Agent Chartier says he showed him the arrest warrant. The arrest warrant we had put into evidence, Your Honor. So you're aware that --

THE COURT: I have that.

MR. KLEIN: When Special Agent Chartier met with the prosecutors on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018, he disclosed neither of those facts to the prosecutors. He only disclosed, and I can quote from it, Your Honor, if you want me to quote from it, or I can bring up the email so you can see the disclosure.

THE COURT: No, you may proceed.

MR. KLEIN: This is the disclosure we got. "Once Mr. Hutchins and Agent Chartier were behind closed doors leading to a stairwell, Mr. Hutchins was placed in handcuffs and told that he was under arrest. Mr. Hutchins asked why he was arrested, and he was told that, once in an interview room, they could talk further."

There's no discussion of being shown an arrest warrant -- or being told of an arrest warrant in a stairwell. Then once they get down in the interview room, the disclosure is, "When they arrived at the interview room, Agent Chartier removed the handcuffs from Mr. Hutchins.

Agent Chartier identified himself and showed his FBI credentials to Mr. Hutchins. Agent Chartier then read Mr. Hutchins his rights from an Advice of Rights form.

Mr. Hutchins indicated he understood his rights.

"Agent Chartier then gave the Advice of Rights form to Mr. Hutchins, and Mr. Hutchins was asked to read the form. Mr. Hutchins read the form. And after reading it, he

signed it. Agents Butcher and Chartier then signed the form.

"Mr. Hutchins then received, read, and signed the acknowledgment of penalties for false statements to the FBI.

"Mr. Hutchins then made a statement to Agent Chartier and Butcher."

And then from there the interview went on.

There's no mention of being shown an arrest warrant before the taping of the interview began, and that's a critical point in our briefing here, Your Honor, because we raised this in our briefing, and it's an important point, which is that Mr. Hutchins, to knowingly and intelligently and voluntarily waive your rights, you need to have some sense of what's at issue here. And the fact is -- and I think it will come together when we put it all together later in argument -- is that they deceived Mr. Hutchins the entire time about the purpose of this interview.

He, in fact, wasn't shown the arrest warrant -- and we've heard that from Special Agent Butcher -- until over an hour into the interview or the interrogation. He was never shown the indictment. Within 30 seconds of it starting with the tape, he asked what was this about, and they said, "We'll get to that later."

And so I think this is a very critical point for us. And the two people that can establish it, the only two,

or one of the two, is either of the prosecutors.

And then the second reason we want to call them is because Special Agent Butcher claims that she told them about changing this time, and we don't believe that's accurate. We don't believe she told them before April 18<sup>th</sup>.

The first time we learned of the changing of the time was on April 18<sup>th</sup>. That's when we received an email from the prosecutors describing that.

And so what she testified today was, "No, I told them a long time ago, not on April 18<sup>th</sup> but even before that."

And so we would want to ask them about when she first told them about that fact. And, again, the timing of when he signed this form could not be more critical. And so I think that's another important fact.

Again, she made them witnesses to this fact. So that's why we want to call them.

One second.

And to be clear, the issue isn't the fact that the time was changed, because we all know it was changed now, but when it was changed.

THE COURT: Well, when it was changed in terms of whether it was changed in Las Vegas or whether it was changed five days later here in Milwaukee?

MR. KLEIN: When it was changed whether in Las Vegas, whether in Milwaukee, and who that was disclosed to after the fact.

THE COURT: Before I ask some questions,

Mr. Chmelar or Mr. Proctor, do you wish to respond?

MR. CHMELAR: To all aspects of what Mr. Klein has indicated?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CHMELAR: So, yes.

THE COURT: I guess first to his request to call you as a witness and then the topics you wish to cover.

MR. CHMELAR: Sure. I think the request itself is ridiculous, and I was trying to think of an adjective to describe the request when he told us about it.

It's hard for me to put into words. I've been doing this for a long time. I've never had anybody suggest that we would be witnesses except in state court practice when I actually took statements from victims.

We provided, as we noted in our briefings, the information that they're now contending is impeaching at their request. I don't believe we were obligated to provide it; nonetheless, we provided it. And we specifically noted in the correspondence to the defendant's attorneys that the information we provided were our summaries, not the agents, meaning these were not agent statements. These were our

summaries off our recollections of what took place. None of it is inconsistent with what -- so two points: None of it is inconsistent with what the agents testified about. There may be things that are not included, but that's because they're summaries. And I can tell you that if I were called -- and I'll let Mr. Proctor speak for himself -- I'm not going to say anything that is inconsistent with what the agents said because the agents are the ones that, despite what Mr. Klein is saying in claiming that we are the only ones, Mr. Proctor and myself are the only ones who could establish this information. Well, that's clearly false. We just had two witnesses who established it. We rely on the agents, and we are not in a position to contradict what they said.

There are lots of things in the summary. I don't know how long the agents testified for, but they testified for a long time. There's one page of bullet points on the topics that we felt was maybe new information that we felt as a courtesy of the request we sent over to them.

But, you know, I can tell you that if I was asked anything -- I'm not in a position to contradict what they said. I wasn't there. I rely on them and what they say.

Simply because I didn't put it in a summary, or, you know, Mr. Proctor and myself talked and put it -- summarized some of the information, it wasn't included

doesn't mean it didn't happen, or that's not the way that it unfolded from the agent's perspective.

So on the substance of the request, there's no grounds to call us as witnesses. We're not witnesses. The agents are the witnesses. Information we obtain during preparatory sessions was exactly that. It's just information during preparatory sessions. Information we passed over, as I indicated, were summaries. We never asked the agents to review them. They're certainly not statements of the agents. So it's not impeaching of the agents.

As for the substance of the actual impeachments, whether or not the times were actually changed on the Advice of Rights form here on the 7<sup>th</sup> when the agent returned from Las Vegas or in Las Vegas is, from the Government's perspective, meaningless. The times were altered or amended on the face of the documents -- on the face of that document, Exhibit 9.

The defense has been in possession of Exhibit 9 since very early on in the case. It was one of the first documents that was tendered in discovery, and Your Honor has Exhibit 9. It's clear that it was amended on the face. Whether or not it was amended after the interview in Las Vegas or here, from, as I said, the Government's perspective, we don't see how it plays any important part in determining whether or not the Miranda warnings were given

prior to the interview starting, which Agent Chartier and Butcher both testified to happened. The defense, in their own motion, states that it happened prior to the interview starting because in their motion, they say the colloquy concerning the Advice of Rights happened before the recording started, and the recording is the interview.

So whether or not the times were amended or not here or there, and whether or not, you know, Agent Butcher told us she amended it, we knew it was amended because we can look at it. Anybody looking at it can see it was amended.

So I think, in essence, twofold: One, I'm not in a position, and I feel I can speak for Mr. Proctor -- he's nodding "yes" -- he's not a position to contradict what the witnesses testified about because we only provided summaries.

Two, the relevance and the value of that impeaching information, to the extent it is impeaching or would be impeaching if any of it can be established, is minimal and certainly is no grounds for either Mr. Proctor or myself to testify about anything.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Proctor, did you wish to add anything, or, Mr. Klein, did you wish to add anything?

MR. PROCTOR: I don't wish to add anything.

Mr. Chmelar said enough.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Klein.

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. I agree with this fact, which is the agent's testimony is their testimony, and Your Honor is being asked to rely on that, and Your Honor, as part of that, has to evaluate their credibility, and it goes directly to their credibility when we have two agents who have said completely contradictory things here today.

One agent testified that he showed the arrest warrant to Mr. Hutchins before the recording of the interview began when he was giving the Advice of Rights. That's Special Agent Chartier.

The other agent this afternoon later said the first time it was shown was over an hour into the interview. That's directly contradictory testimony, and it goes right to our argument about deception. And when those agents met with the prosecutors in preparation for this, Special Agent Chartier did not share that information. We contend that he made that up. And so it is an important fact that the first time he disclosed that he showed the arrest warrant, or claims he showed the arrest warrant was today on the stand, and it's directly contradicted by the other special agent, and the two witnesses to that prep session are these prosecutors. There was no other agent in the room, and it's

simply to establish from them that when they met with him, he did not tell them that he showed the arrest warrant. It helps buttress our argument the first time he did it was today, and that's in direct contradiction to another agent.

And as for the timing of the form and when it was signed, the agent claims she told the prosecutors well in advance that she had changed the time. We don't believe that's true. Her credibility is at issue here. They are depending on both of their credibility to claim that Mr. Hutchins knowingly and intelligently waived his rights. And if they're both found not to be credible, then this evidence should definitely be suppressed, and we think it should be. So it goes right to the heart of this case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Klein.

I'm denying the request. I think, as you know in making the request, from being a very experienced attorney yourself, that you're asking for something that's very extraordinary. And to allow it, I think, would allow to -- in every single case, the prosecutor can be called to talk about what witnesses told them during their preparation session. That's in contradiction to what they testified in court, or that's different, or that shows discrepancy. That's almost in every case they meet with their witnesses. That does not change them from counsel of record to ordinary witnesses in the case.

I don't think it's appropriate. I would not allow it. Of course, the record is the record, and you can certainly make all the arguments that you have made on the record that we have.

And, additionally, to the extent that you think my ruling is incorrect, you made a proffer as to what you wanted to elicit from the Government, and that could be further reviewed as appropriate.

With that, Mr. Klein, any other witnesses?

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. We want to call Mr. Hutchins, but we wanted to ask Your Honor in advance about the scope of where you would allow the prosecutor to go because we have some very, very -- I'll add very discrete questions. So it will be important to us to know the scope of what you would go to because we're not trying to open the door to other areas, to be clear. I'm happy to walk Your Honor through our questions.

THE COURT: So just to answer your question.

Generally, the scope of this hearing is on the voluntariness question. This is not a hearing on whether Mr. Hutchins is guilty or not guilty. So I'm not interested in anything that goes beyond the factors of voluntariness.

Does that answer your question?

MR. KLEIN: No, but it's helpful to know that to the extent that I did understand that, and I appreciate you

saying that.

I guess our question is -- there's two areas we would think about asking him about, and I'll explain what they are. The first one was what he was aware of about United Kingdom advisements when people get arrested on the date of his arrest. So, again, the questions would be very simple. "On August 2<sup>nd</sup>, were you aware of any UK advisements people get when arrested?"

He'll answer that question, which ones, or which ones --

THE COURT: Is your question to me are you allowed to ask those questions? Is that your question?

MR. KLEIN: I know we're allowed to ask them. I guess we don't perceive these questions as opening the door to other questions, like, beyond the scope of them crossing him on what his understanding of UK law was. So that's what I'm going to.

So if we ask him about UK law, we believe the scope of the cross should be limited to his understanding of UK law. By "UK," I mean United Kingdom.

THE COURT: I understood that, Mr. Klein.

Yes, that's fair. It's so obvious to me I don't know if I'm missing something.

MR. CHMELAR: I think you are, Judge. I think Mr. Klein is saying if Mr. Hutchins decides to take the

stand and proffers to the Court that he understood the
United Kingdom version of Miranda to be whatever it is, then
we're not allowed to ask him any questions about his
understanding of the Miranda rights as he was read and
waived them with the agents.

THE COURT: Is that your question, Mr. Klein?

MR. KLEIN:

Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that's too limited, right? If he's asked about UK law, and the topic is, you know, how does he understand UK Miranda rights versus U.S. Miranda rights? I mean, UK Miranda rights, I actually don't have them, Miranda, but UK rights as far as a suspect is. Yes, the Government can ask him questions about his understanding of Miranda rights, his understanding of Exhibit 9.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, just to put a point on it.

We weren't going to ask him his understanding of UK rights

versus Miranda. It would simply be his understanding of UK

rights. So we would not be asking him to draw a comparison

to the rights, which is what the prosecutors, I suspected

and now understand, would like to cross him on. So it's

simply, "Were you aware of UK advisements? Which ones?"

And then, "What was your basis for your understanding," not

asking anything about U.S. Miranda rights. There's no

direct question about U.S. Miranda rights.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. CHMELAR: I mean, it can't be limited like -I respect whatever your decision is, but it can't be
reserved or restricted in that way.

They've proffered certain allegations. And, in fact, Mr. Klein just claimed one of the agents lied on the stand before the Court.

If Mr. Hutchins takes the stand, and they proffered in their motion for this hearing and in the motion to suppress that he was under the influence of drugs, he was coerced, he didn't understand his rights, I don't see how he could take the stand and state what essentially is UK law without answering any questions concerning the nature of the interview. What would be the point of having him describe his understanding of whatever the UK version of Miranda is? It would serve no purpose. It shouldn't be limited.

If he is asked a question that he doesn't want to answer or he feels may be incriminating, he has the right, under the Fifth Amendment, to claim his privilege not to answer that question. But the Government shouldn't be limited in their cross-examination of Mr. Hutchins in these areas just as the defense wasn't limited to much extent about their cross-examination with the agents concerning what would be the totality of the circumstances of the events that unfolded on the  $2^{\rm nd}$ .

So we would object to the idea that it can somehow be limited before he testifies. And we certainly intend to ask a whole variety of questions regarding his claim of impairment, his drug use, his ability to understand, write and read English. These are all relevant factors that Your Honor is to consider. And I would say that without those things coming in, they've proffered nothing and established nothing regarding the suggestion that he was under the influence and failed to comprehend the events of August 2<sup>nd</sup>.

So it's up to them, and they can choose to go any way they want, but we're prepared to fully cross-exam

Mr. Hutchins. And I guess it's up to him and the Court if he doesn't want to answer certain questions, but I don't see why he should be limited in any way. If the questions are within the scope of the hearing, why should they be limited in some fashion?

THE COURT: So where I began, because I initially misunderstood the scope of your question, Mr. Klein, I thought you were asking me is this a free fall to ask Mr. Hutchins substantive questions regarding the merits of the case or questions that may elicit culpable questions. I made the general statement, No, we're here for the voluntary to -- on the motion to suppress, whether or not his statement was voluntarily made.

Now, as I understand it, you were just going to ask a very narrow question, a couple of questions, What is your understanding of your rights as a UK citizen when you were arrested? And whether, then, the Government is just limited to that.

I think the Government is right, Mr. Klein, that the question is whether Mr. Hutchins' waiver, if any, was voluntarily, intelligent, and knowingly made. So they can cross-examine him on that.

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, in this sense I disagree, Your Honor. I would say that -- you know, if we got up and asked him, "What was your date of birth," just to establish the fact that he's under 18, right? I don't believe that would open the door to a million other questions.

I think there is naturally a scope and a general objection which is beyond the scope. I understand necessarily the rules always don't -- necessarily always apply in these hearings, but I think the general notion that you can't go beyond the scope of the direct. And to be clear, our examination of the agents was directly in the scope of everything they testified about. They testified about the Miranda waiver and what they did. So we would be limiting our direct very pinpoint, very targeted. Just like if someone submits an affidavit, which in some other jurisdictions they do, and maybe it's just to establish,

like, I own this house, right? And that's what's in the search warrant context. And so the only thing you would be allowed to cross-examine the person about, it would be about: "Do you own this house or not," right?

You're not putting everything else into play, like, "What did the agents do? Did you sign a consent?"

So I think that's the point I'm focused on, is that we don't believe we would be opening the door to a broad array of questions just because we specifically asked about his understanding of UK law.

Again, no questions about United States law, no questions about what happened that day, only his understanding of UK law on that day. I think it's very pinpoint, and I think it would be beyond the scope to say that now they can ask him -- show him Exhibit 9, show him any exhibit they want, ask him if he was drunk. That's just well beyond the scope of where we even went on direct because then we would have to get up, Your Honor, on redirect and have to go through an entire colloquy on those same points, and that's what we are not intending to do. Our point is just to ask a very few targeted questions.

And I'll disagree with Mr. Chmelar on this point, which is, you know, we raised arguments, and we're here at this hearing because now we can argue from the facts that are in this hearing. We're not stuck with one thing. We're

allowed to argue what the facts show. We didn't know what this hearing would show, and that's why we're here.

So the fact that we might -- our argument might be shaped differently after this hearing is totally appropriate just like their response is going to be shaped very differently. So I think we should be permitted to ask these very specific questions, and they should only be permitted to cross on the topic area of the questions.

THE COURT: So two follow-up questions, Mr. Klein:

One is even within the narrow topic of understanding UK

rights, it's part of the context of your larger motion that

because the UK rights are different is one piece of the

equation and Mr. Hutchins not making a voluntary and knowing

waiver. So in that context, that is why I believe it's

relevant, that they can cross-examine him on factors that

make or not make the waiver knowingly made. So, I guess,

that's not a question. That's more of a statement.

And the second thing I want to say is more of a question. I do understand that when facts are developed at an evidentiary hearing, then the arguments are going to be shaped based on the facts elicited. So is it your position at this point, then, your focus of your arguments will only be on the fact of UK citizenship and UK law being different, and you are now abandoning the other factors you had put in your motion regarding impairment based on drug use and lack

of sleep?

MR. KLEIN: No, that's not what we're doing,
Your Honor. We're not abandoning those arguments. I think
the record is clear when you listen to the tape that we can
establish that he was exhausted; that he had been out
partying. We're not abandoning those other arguments. I
didn't mean to imply that. I'm just saying that how we
argue this is going to be based on how the evidence develops
here today. And so we may raise points and emphasize
different points when we talk about what the significance of
what we learned today is.

I think, though, again, our point is that he talks about the UK advisements and what the understanding was. That's just what he understood. So we're not going to make an argument that, you know, about what he understood about the Miranda rights, and we're not going to put words in his mouth about what he understood about Miranda. We would just argue here's what he understood about UK law. So that's what we would put in. Here's what his understanding of UK law was.

THE COURT: You certainly can. You can certainly ask him questions about that. That's not what we're discussing right now.

The question is, then, if you limit your direct to that, whether or not the Government can then ask him about

1 other factors because they have the burden of establishing 2 that the waiver was knowing and voluntarily made. 3 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: And my answer to that is, yes, they 5 can ask Mr. Hutchins questions on the other factors relevant 6 to knowing and voluntariness of the waiver if he testifies. 7 But they cannot, as I said from the outset, question him 8 regarding the merits, the culpability, or anything like 9 that. 10 MR. KLEIN: Is that your ruling, Your Honor? 11 THE COURT: It is. 12 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, can we have a second to 13 confer about that? 14 THE COURT: You may. You may take a couple 15 minutes. 16 (Break.) 17 THE COURT: Mr. Klein, how do you wish to proceed? 18 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, we've talked to our 19 We've talked among ourselves. We're not going to 20 call Mr. Hutchins. So we have no other witnesses to call. 21 I have a few procedural questions, but I also know 22 Mr. Stiller has an issue he wants to attend to, and I'm not 23 sure how much longer we plan to stay here today. He can 24 speak for himself about it. 25 THE COURT: Before I hear from Mr. Stiller,

1 Mr. Hutchins, you understand that you do have a right to 2 testify at this hearing if you choose to. Do you understand 3 that? 4 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 5 THE COURT: And is it your choice not to testify 6 today after consultation with your attorneys? 7 THE DEFENDANT: That's correct. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 Mr. Stiller, sir. 10 MR. STILLER: Judge, sorry to burden you with 11 I'm the only one available to pick my children up. 12 And so if I'm not out of here about now, they're going to be 13 on the curb. So I'm not necessarily saying the world needs 14 to bend to my schedule. My formal role is over, and so I 15 guess I'm seeking to be excused. 16 THE COURT: You may be excused if it's fine with 17

your co-counsel.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It was my intent to hear oral arguments on this motion this evening. So if you're not the person doing the oral argument, and I know how those childcare fees add up having been victim to them many a time, you certainly are excused.

Mr. Klein, do you wish to relieve Mr. Stiller? MR. KLEIN: Well, obviously, I would like him to stay, Your Honor. And I actually would hope that we could order a copy -- there were some developments here that we would like to review the transcript on to fully advise you of our arguments. So I would hope that we could order the transcript on a very expedited basis and submit you a brief.

What's today?

THE COURT: Today is the 16<sup>th</sup>. May 16<sup>th</sup>.

MR. KLEIN: Submit you a brief next week. Next week is Memorial Day weekend. It's also my wedding anniversary. I'll be in big trouble, speaking of personal issues. That we be permitted to order the transcript to properly brief Your Honor on some of the points we would want to raise. And I think, with that, we would ask for just a quick turnaround on the briefing schedule. We can talk to the court reporter afterwards and order the transcript on an expedited basis.

THE COURT: Does the Government wish to be heard on proceeding on briefs as opposed to oral arguments?

MR. CHMELAR: We're prepared to argue right now. The case has been going on for some time, and I know the last time we were here, Your Honor expressed some interest in moving the case forward. So we would like to proceed to arguments and move forward with a decision on the case. And if Your Honor, after arguments, feels additional briefing is necessary, then, you know, that's the Court's decision, but we're prepared to argue the case. And if the Court is

prepared to make a decision based on the arguments and the testimony today, we're happy to move forward with the decision on the issues.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Klein, here's what I will do. I will hear oral arguments tonight, but I will leave the matter open for a week, and I'll give you the opportunity if you want to get expedited briefing --

MR. KLEIN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. My client was talking to me.

THE COURT: That's okay.

And supplement what you have argued today with specifics to the record or specific anything that you wish me to consider, but the reason I want to move forward, as you know, is that the pleadings on the other motions are completed. So I'm going to turn my attention to -- I want to have all the decisions all out at once instead of bifurcating them in any way and moving this matter forward to the trial court.

You can check with the court reporter.

We'll proceed to oral argument today. And,
Mr. Klein, I will leave the record open until next Friday
the 25<sup>th</sup>. Does that work?

MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, that's my wedding anniversary. Can we make it the --

THE COURT: Okay. How many years, Mr. Klein?

1 That will decide whether you get an extension or not. 2 MR. KLEIN: This might be the last year of my 3 anniversary. I think that's relevant. 4 It's five years, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. That's an important 6 milestone, so I will allow it. So you're asking until when, 7 Mr. Klein? 8 MR. KLEIN: The Wednesday after. So it will be 9 two weeks from now. THE COURT: So Wednesday after is the 30<sup>th</sup>. And 10 11 then we'll make it simultaneous. If the Government also, 12 after pondering and looking at additional -- you have 13 something else you want to add to what you have submitted to 14 your oral presentation this evening, you'll have until then 15 to also submit it. MR. CHMELAR: Very well. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. It is Mr. Hutchins' 18 motion; however, the Government has the burden here in 19 showing that any statement was legally obtained. 20 So, Mr. Chmelar, maybe I'll start with you, or 21 Mr. Proctor. 22 MR. CHMELAR: If it's okay, Judge, I'll start the 23 argument. Of course, I invited Mr. Proctor to tell me 24 anything. I know certain Courts are reluctant to let two 25 attorneys on the topic speak, but if allowed, if Mr. Proctor has additional arguments, I'd ask that he just be allowed to make them after I conclude instead of conveying them to me, then from me to you.

THE COURT: Well, then, Mr. Klein is at a disadvantage because his --

MR. CHMELAR: Ms. Hofmann is --

THE COURT: He does have Ms. Hofmann here.

MR. CHMELAR: Yes.

THE COURT: So two against two is fair game. If it's against one, not so much.

MR. CHMELAR: Okay.

MR. KLEIN: Ms. Hofmann is like three, Your Honor.

MR. CHMELAR: So, Judge, I guess we'll break down our argument on the two factors that they argued to the Court to secure this evidentiary hearing and the positions they took on the motion to suppress, one being that the waiver was not knowingly and voluntarily made; and, two, that somehow the statement was coerced. I don't think that the second one takes much consideration. So I'll probably spend most of my argument -- or our argument to the waiver part, which I really don't think, based on, now that I think about it, is much in contention either.

There's been nothing really to contradict the agent's testimony that the Miranda rights, the Advice of Rights form was both read to Mr. Hutchins, given to him

after it was read to him, and he was allowed to read it, review it, ask questions about it, and that he signed it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think the law and the facts are against Mr. Hutchins on this issue. And Your Honor knows we filed extensive briefing on this prehearing, so all the cases — or any of the cases that we reference are found in the Government filings. And I'm happy to provide further identification if anything I cite to is confusing or you need further clarification.

But under Collins -- it's the 612 F.3d 574, Seventh Circuit case, it collects cases regarding the Waiver of Rights and what's necessary. And that's a case that describes that -- it refers to a waiver -- it refers to an example of an individual unable to waive Miranda in certain situations including a case, you know, where the agents might have well been speaking gibberish to the interviewee. That's certainly not the case. I mean, Mr. Hutchins is competent in English. He's appeared here every time without an interpreter. The agents interviewed him. The Miranda waiver form is in English. You have the audio recording which is in English. The jail calls are all in English. Mr. Hutchins is certainly competent in reading and writing the English language. So the fact that he was advised of his Miranda warnings in English and had a chance to read them and stated that he understood his rights, then that's

sufficient to satisfy Miranda under the case law in the Seventh Circuit. There's nothing to support the position that he didn't understand his Miranda rights.

And the Springer case cited in our brief states that an individual who understands and comprehends English, once rights are read to them, and they're given the Miranda warnings, or the Advice of Rights form, and they read it and they read it, they have a chance to read it, and they indicate they understand those rights, that's sufficient to satisfy Miranda, and that's exactly what happened in this case.

There was this proffer to secure the evidentiary hearing that Mr. Hutchins was somehow confused between the UK, you know, the law or U.S. Miranda rights, but there's been nothing to establish that. Nothing. It was just a proffer in basically like a footnote in their motion to suppress.

So the law as it stands in the Seventh Circuit and by the U.S. Supreme Court, what happened and what transpired between the agents and Mr. Hutchins regarding the Advice of Rights is review that form and his signing of his understanding and waiving those rights is sufficient. And as this Court knows, in most cases you don't even need a signed Miranda waiver form. It can be oral. And in some cases, you don't even need that. It can be an indirect

indication that they've waived when an individual just starts talking to the agents after they've been advised of their rights.

So the situation we have here where a form is presented, and it is signed, and two agents testified and witnessed the signature, is sufficient.

And as we noted in our filings, it's clear that -and Your Honor asked some questions about his education and
his age and his background. There is discussion on the
recording once you review it to that effect, but we would
say that -- and as we stated in our motion, he, through his
attorneys, he's a self-proclaimed computer expert. He works
in the cyber security for a U.S. company. There's no
indication that he should be confused by the Advice of
Rights. They're very clear and simplistic, and they're laid
out in a point-by-point-by-point basis. It's not even a
paragraph which may -- some people may find confusing. It
is laid out almost bullet by bullet, and it's very simple to
comprehend, and there's nothing to suggest that he had the
inability to comprehend that.

And I want to go to the other proffered reason, which was that he was exhausted and partying all week and staying up in the wee hours. As the Court noted in the order granting the evidentiary hearing, which is document 61, and that was taken from the defendant's position in

their motion to suppress. This Court decided a case, which we cite in our response, which is Tellefsen,

T-E-L-L-E-F-S-E-N. It was a 2011 case where it was undisputed by the parties that the defendant in that case was intoxicated. According to the order issued by this

Court, they had a .27 to .33 breath alcohol content level at the time of the confrontation with police officers, and that dealt with both the consent to search and the waiver of

Miranda. And this Court noted that there's a difference between intoxication and impairment; and, in fact, there was an expert that testified in that particular case which the Court, based on the order and opinion as written, adopted.

And I think that's the important distinction here.

What they've argued is that he was under a nonspecific, unidentified drug of some sort, and that he hadn't slept, but at no point did they argue that he was impaired in any way. And just arguing that he was impaired isn't enough. They haven't put forward anything to suggest that he was impaired. And, in fact, the evidence would completely contradict any such claim because if you listen to the jail call, and you listen to the post-arrest interview, Mr. Hutchins is, as the agents noted, totally lucid during the interview, at times he is evasive. At times he is minimizing his involvement. It's clear that he's testing from -- you know, it's reasonable to infer from

the recording that he's testing the agents on what they actually know before giving up information.

So there's no indication in that that he's impaired; in fact, other information about his arrival there is inconsistent with the fact that he was impaired rather than, you know, under the influence of some sort of a narcotic which, by the way, they haven't established.

He arrived to the airport in plenty of time for his flight. There's no indication that he left behind any beverage. He was in the frame of mind to know that he should contact his mother to advise her that he was not going to be making his return flight so she didn't waste her time coming from their residence to pick him up at the airport.

And, you know, the impairment intoxication is an important distinction between -- the impairment goes to the ability of somebody's -- goes towards somebody's ability to function. And here, as I said, there's no evidence that he was impaired because he was totally functional during the interview.

And the agents, as you recall, talked about -- or at least Agent Chartier talked about the fact that they showed him a list of 80 names. It was just names, nicknames, that he was able to recall.

There was a situation where he was shown what was

referred to as string code, S-T-R-I-N-G. He was able to identify that as at least being a string. And then he was shown chats that related to conversations he had back in 2015, yet he was able to put those chats in context and describe what actually happened during those chats that he was shown.

So in the broadest of terms, he was functioning at a very high level, and I think that will be clear once the Court reviews the recording of the post-arrest interview.

The idea that somehow the amendments to the time somehow negate the idea that he was given Miranda at a time I think is unfounded and should be rejected. Both agents testified that he was advised of his rights beforehand.

And, again, in fact, we noted in our most recent filing that we filed yesterday, that part of their filing, Judge, to get the hearing was to explore what happened prior to the recording device being turned on, but in that they say that -- you know, I'm referring to document 55 on page 10 at the very top. It's signed by all three attorneys. It says, again, the colloquy -- this is, quote, "again, the colloquy involving the advisements and Waiver of Rights happened before any recording started."

What we're fighting about here with the defense are the statements on that recording. Nobody has identified any inculpatory statements made prior to the beginning of

the recording. It was the Advice of Rights and the preliminary matters to start off the interview. And based on their filing, they acknowledge that it happened before the recording started.

So, again, based on the law and the facts, the defense loses this motion.

The times, again, are just a straw man argument to avoid addressing the fact that Mr. Hutchins understands

English, can read English, and signed the Miranda waiver form, and waived his rights.

I'm going to circle back to that theory when we talk about the jail call because Your Honor asked us what the relevance of the jail calls were, at least the ones we submitted, and I think it goes to an important part related to that.

On the voluntariness of this statement, as we laid out in our prehearing memo of law, intoxication, or in this case, impairment, if they even established it, is only half of what they need to prove because an essential predicate to finding a statement is involuntary is some sort of course of tactics by the agents, and that's based on the Carson case that we cite on page 2 of our prehearing filing.

And based on the recording, which speaks for itself, but also the agents' testimony, none of that -- there was no course of tactics. They were joking.

Mr. Hutchins, as I said, was evasive. He wasn't being coerced. I don't think -- it's our position, and I think it's reasonably inferred from the tone, tenor, and the interactions with the agents was not being coerced into saying anything. He was trying to avoid saying things, and only when he felt it necessary to admit something did he do that. That's the opposite of coercion. That's Mr. Hutchins taking control of the interview and dictating what has happened.

And, again, when we get to the jail calls, I think there's a reason and an explanation -- two reasons and explanations that provide a reason why Mr. Hutchins was so willing to talk to the agents, and it had nothing to do with the deceit or course of tactics. There were no threats, no promises, nothing like that. And this idea that appeared in the most recent filing from the defense on the 4<sup>th</sup>, I think, where they start talking about deceit, these cases all involve civil IRS agents approaching people and talking to them and not telling them that it relates to a criminal investigation.

Mr. Hutchins knew this was a criminal investigation. He knew because he was placed in handcuffs before anything else happened, and he was told he was under arrest. He then was taken to the interview room. And you can listen to the recording, Judge, because there is a very

specific moment where Mr. Hutchins utters the words "Kronos," and then indicates, "Is this what it's about? You're looking for the developer of Kronos?"

And as Agent Chartier said, "No, not anymore."

And Mr. Hutchins attempted to deny that it was

him. And then goes through the whole process of describing

how and what his role in the development of that malware was

and his partnership with the other individual who has been

indicted in the case, or at least the person he knew by a

specific alias, and he goes through this whole history about

his relationship with that individual.

So, again, this idea that there is some sort of deceit or hiding of the ball about what the case was about is another straw man argument. It doesn't exist. It's a fallacy. And it's clear in the recording that he knows exactly what it's about because they discuss it. They show him the chats which involve Kronos. They show him the 80 names. And there's an individual in there who he identifies as the individual he provided Kronos, the other aliases used by that individual and the string. You know, he doesn't identify it as his own, but he certainly makes admissions, Judge, as clearly expressed on the recording of his involvement and the manufacturing, the development of the malware.

I also want to note that other things that

happened during that interview also suggest that he was a willing participant and he wasn't coerced. He unlocked his cell phones. He consented to having his cell phones, his backpack, computer searched.

And I want to come back to something that I missed in my other argument about his level of intoxication compared to impairment. There were two sequences on the recording which are important, I think, to this. One is when he's unlocking one of his phones, and he complains about the password being so long that he has trouble unlocking it when he's intoxicated or drunk, and he unlocks the phone. So I think that contradicts, or at least tends to cut across or against the argument that he was somehow under the influence of something, again, which hasn't been established by anything other than a statement by the attorneys.

And the other one was the joking with the agents about their ability to probably guess his password because he's recalling, again, like he did with other instances of information that he's confronted with multiple passwords, the ability to recall multiple passwords in a what may be perceived as a somewhat stressful situation. He's being interviewed by two FBI agents. But it's calm, cool, collected, answering the questions and is fully engaged.

Again, on that same topic, the agents both

testified that there was no observable manifestations of any impairment or ailments. No sweating. I think

Agent Chartier or somebody testified about something related to that, was that Agent Chartier mentioned that he was somewhat jittery. But other than that, you know, there was no other indications and no concern, in addition to the fact that he told them he was not intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol or hadn't been drinking. Whatever.

The record speaks for itself.

I know that in their motion they claim that that somehow, you know, without establishing it, that Mr. Hutchins believed that to mean something else. I guess that's not worth much but I guess could be considered to some degree.

I want to now talk briefly about the calls because I think the jail call we introduced, at least from our perspective, and we would argue is relevant to both of those two issues. The jail call is relevant because it indicates that Mr. Hutchins was not impaired during the post-arrest interview, and it indicates -- at least it suggests that he was not coerced into making these statements, which, again, I think is evident based on the interactions with the agents, but this corroborates that.

He says lots of things during that call. He basically recalls what he told the agents, and the phone

call is hours after the fact. And I would say that if he was impaired, and so impaired he didn't even have the ability to comprehend Miranda, I would say that his ability to recall the events as they transpired hours earlier would be equally confusing and unknown to him, but he recalls them with clarity.

We quoted from the particular jail call, Exhibit 7 to the Court, and we include it as an exhibit. And I think the jail calls are as valuable for what he says as what he doesn't say. He doesn't complain that he was, you know, impaired. He doesn't complain that he was on drugs. He doesn't complain that he was exhausted. He complains -- but he does complain about certain things, but he doesn't complain about any trickery, deception, threats, promises made by the agents to him. He doesn't also complain upon hearing the other speaker tell him, you know, "You don't have to say anything."

In fact, I think it says, "Don't say anything.

It's recorded. Whatever you told them, you told them.

Don't provide any more," yet he does.

He basically, at that point going forward, reiterates everything he told the FBI. And the speaker says, "Well, we're going to try and work on getting you an attorney," yet he still talks.

And the introduction to the call has the traditional notice and advisement from the jail that is common on all these jail calls, "This call is subject to monitoring and recording," and yet he talks.

And I think it suggests what is evident from the interview recording. He's a talkative person, at least in this context. There's nothing that the other caller did to coerce him to make these statements. It was the exact opposite. The speaker was telling him, "Don't say anything," and Mr. Hutchins, for whatever reason, couldn't resist, and he just said it.

So we think it's important in that context. It's also important for their claim that he was unaware of what his Miranda rights were, although they presented nothing to support that position; that when he's being told this by the other caller, there's no indication, "What? I have the right to remain silent? Nobody told me that. I didn't understand that. If I knew that, I wouldn't have said anything."

He just breezes right through that. He just keeps going.

And I said there were two things that were important about the jail call, why we think they're relevant. And we fully understand that. In the context of knowing, you know, the waiver, whether there was a knowing

and voluntary waiver and whether the statement was, you know, voluntary, meaning it was not coerced. You know, the context of what's happened during the interview is important, but, you know, certainly, if an individual called somebody after an interview and said, "I don't know what happened. I was totally under the influence of marijuana. I had smoked marijuana before I arrived, and I have no recollection of what took place," that would be relevant. This is just the same. It's absence of any of those types of things and concerns.

And the other thing that he does say, which I think also tends to go to why he decided to talk to the FBI and say these things, is when he's presented with those chats, the chat logs, which is one of our Government exhibits, 11, he describes them to the other person on the call as undeniable. It was as if they put something in front of him that he was just -- put up his hands and is, like, "What else can I do? They have chat logs of me sending this malware to somebody else. I couldn't even deny those things." And it was almost a situation where the evidence was irrefutable.

So we would argue to the Court that it has nothing to do with any type of coercive tactics or trickery or deceit, again, which they've established none of. It was the fact that the agents had put a strong case together

against Mr. Hutchins, and they knew what questions to ask
Mr. Hutchins and knew just as much about the case as
Mr. Hutchins did, and that allowed them to secure the
statement that they secured. It had nothing to do with any
of the things that would normally be considered coercive
tactics.

And I would additionally argue that how he sounds on the jail call, how he sounds in the post-arrest interview, and how he has sounded and the statements he's made during his multiple court appearances here are all the same. They're indistinguishable. So there's no indication based on the sound that, you know, there was anything suggesting that his temperament and his ability to function was different in any of those settings other than here.

As far as the starting of the recording, it would've been ideal, obviously, to have the recording started or play when the agents walked in the room. But that's not what happened. But, again, nobody has identified any inculpatory statements or admissions that Mr. Hutchins has made that they're now claiming, "Well, that didn't happen."

And, again, as Your Honor pointed out, it's not that he's saying he didn't get his Miranda warnings. He had alleged that he didn't understand them, but there's been nothing to support that. All the evidence is actually to

the -- counters that. So there's been nothing alleged that was obtained from him that we would be seeking to admit that was not on that recording other than, you know, the other evidence we've collected throughout the time. But if we're talking about that post-arrest interview, everything has been documented. They're challenging the recording based on a very finite set of reasons, and we have established that he was read Miranda. He waived his Miranda. He did it knowingly and intelligently.

The other arguments by the defendants are unsupported, and I've used this a couple times, but they are straw man arguments. These are just fallacies to focus the Court's attention to or arguments they want to set up as problems.

Were there mistakes in the case? Yes. Are they of the such that they go to constitutional violation of his rights under Miranda or the Sixth Amendment not to have his involuntary statement taken? No. They are simply clerical errors and errors in the timing of when the recording devices — the recording device was started based on what the agents described as an unusual situation, at least we'll argue it is, that the recording equipment in the interview room was not functional at the time and is usually not done by the interviewing agents. It's done by somebody else.

So unless the Court has any questions on anything

that we've argued here or any of the positions or testimony, we would ask the Court to deny the motion to suppress.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chmelar.

Before I give Mr. Klein the mic, just a quick question. I understand your position that you, the Government, is not seeking to admit any statements made prior to the recording; is that correct?

MR. CHMELAR: So, you know, I want to say yes, but I don't want to give the false impression -- like, the chats that he was presented with, those are chats that happened long before the interview took place. You know, obviously, we seek to admit those, but those didn't result from the agent's interview. So there were no statements that were the product of the agent's interview on that day.

THE COURT: So I was focusing on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. So I'm focusing on the 5 to 10 minutes that the agent testified was not recorded.

Your position is there were no inculpatory statements made during that period?

MR. CHMELAR: Right. The only thing we would rely on and seek to introduce would be the waiver, his acknowledgment of his rights and his acknowledgment that he was advised of the circumstances and the penalties for lying to the FBI.

A lot of the, you know, quote, unquote,

statements, are not inculpatory statements. They're just situational statements. You know, "Why am I under arrest," or, "What is going on?"

So that happened at the time of the -- he was handcuffed. But, no, no inculpatory admissions that we could point to. And I think that's why we put a footnote in our most recent filing because no one has identified any of these things as occurring. It's just, I think, the complaints from --

THE COURT: Mr. Chmelar, if I can interrupt you?

MR. CHMELAR: Sure.

THE COURT: Whether or not statements were made during that time period that the Government didn't use, isn't the importance --

MR. CHMELAR: I'm listening, Judge.

THE COURT: Isn't the importance of that 5 to 10-minute period whether or not Mr. Hutchins voluntarily waived his rights? So if I had the recording, while I can listen to it and evaluate how it was presented to him and evaluate his response to it?

MR. CHMELAR: Sure. And I think that's totally true, but people waive their rights all the time, and they're not in writing and they're not recorded, but they verbally waived their rights. They consent to searches all the time that aren't recorded. People make admissions and

statements all the time that aren't recorded, and they waive their rights for various constitutional protections frequently, and those are not recorded.

So the fact that there was an opportunity to record it, and it wasn't recorded certainly, as Your Honor pointed out, it would make life much easier for all the parties, and we probably wouldn't be litigating all of this as much. But it doesn't mean that it didn't happen. It's just not recorded. And they don't even contest that he wasn't advised of his rights. They agree he was. I mean, you asked Mr. Klein -- I think there was a colloquy between the Court and the defense about this -- but I don't think anybody has ever said he wasn't advised of his rights.

There's a blanket claim that somehow he didn't understand it, but it's unsupported. And the only evidence you have -- and we would proffer it's credible evidence -- is that he did. And under the law, in the Seventh

Circuit -- and I keep qualifying because I didn't really look at the other circuits, but in the Seventh Circuit, and I'm just presuming the Supreme Court, if he's an English speaker, and he's able to comprehend and understand English, and he's advised of his rights in English orally, he's handed the sheet of paper, and he reads it, and he signs it, and he indicates he understands it, which all happened here, that's it. He has then waived -- knowingly waived his

rights unless he can establish somehow some other factors that would prevent the Court from accepting that, and that is what we've done. We presented evidence to that effect. And there's nothing to contradict that other than these attacks on Agent Butcher regarding when the actual time was entered on the report. Nobody testified that he was not advised of his rights prior to the interview regardless of whatever time it occurred. Everyone agrees he was advised during -- prior to the recording starting. Even the defense agrees to that in their filing. So that would be our position on it.

So I understand, yes, it would be easier to understand the dynamics of the interview, but if it's anything -- and I think it's reasonable to infer that it was consistent with the nature of the interview after that, then by all indications it would indicate that it was a very -- I don't want to say pleasant experience, but a non- -- there's no issue with the exchange that took place because the rest of the interview at times we say is friendly back and forth and other times it's, you know, very serious.

So there's nothing in the record to suggest in the jail call, post-arrest interview, or the testimony you took that somehow he was not advised of his right and didn't understand those rights.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chmelar.

Mr. Klein, the mic is yours.

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Before I start, I want to say I think there was some just real quick confusion on an exhibit that was entered in. We had understood there were actually two jail calls, and they reference jail calls, and we have a transcript for just one jail call. And I think they should both be entered as exhibits, and I'm not clear if they both have been or just one.

THE COURT: I only have Exhibit 7, an August 2<sup>nd</sup> jail recording.

MR. KLEIN: That's the transcript, but I don't know the disk.

THE COURT: The disk?

MR. KLEIN: That's what I'm asking. I think there might've been a mistake, and we think both calls should be in evidence.

MR. PROCTOR: We introduced just the first call, Your Honor, in the interest of time, but we have no problem introducing the second disk -- or the second jail call and transcript. We just held it off out of the interest of time.

THE COURT: Mr. Klein, is that what you are requesting?

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So please submit that as well.

And, Mr. Proctor, you can take care of that after Mr. Klein is done with his argument in the interest of time. So, Mr. Klein, the floor is yours.

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor.

On some level, Your Honor, I think we're a little bit two ships passing in the night with the Government, which is they are focused on things factually and legally that we don't think are actually dispositive for what we're talking about here, and that's what I want to focus Your Honor on. Okay. It's what happened here, what evidence do you have, and what conclusions can we draw from that evidence under the law?

And so I think what I would do is you got to start from the beginning, which is what -- this is the Government's burden, and because it is their burden, the Seventh Circuit has said this is such an important right, right? The Sixth Amendment right, whether you properly waive it, that -- and I'm citing from our brief on page 6 that we filed on May 9<sup>th</sup>, so it's docket No. 75 -- "The importance of the Sixth Amendment in protecting the accused requires that Courts indulge in every reasonable presumption against waiver."

And that's what we're asking Your Honor to do because we don't think they can show that there was a knowing intelligent waiver; that Mr. Hutchins properly

waived his rights.

And what I really want to focus on today is -- and the Government -- you know, we're not saying that

Mr. Hutchins was beaten over with fire hoses or physically abused, and that's why he may or may not have signed this form, when or when he may not have signed it. But I would like to focus on what happened that day and why it wouldn't have been a knowing and intelligent waiver. And this is what the evidence shows, Your Honor. He was deceived.

That's clear. He did not understand what was going on. You cannot waive your right if you don't understand why they're questioning you, and that has been held in this circuit.

And so, yes, coercion, intimidation are part of it. But if you look at -- and, sorry, it's also been held by the Supreme Court. If you look at the Moran case cited on page 7 of our brief, deception is an independent ground for suppression. And that's what I want to focus on right now.

So what happened here, Your Honor, what we've heard. And what the evidence will show when you review it all is Mr. Hutchins was deceived. They intentionally set this up to deceive him. They didn't arrest him when he arrived in Las Vegas. They didn't arrest him during that whole week. They didn't arrest him that morning when they knew he was leaving. They didn't arrest him when he got to

the airport. They didn't arrest him when he walked through security and they would've been certain he was not armed and could've been no danger.

And the agent testified something about, like, "Oh, well, there's a sinkhole issue, and he could've done something."

When he goes through security, Your Honor -you've been through security at the airport. You're not
holding your computer. You can't have a gun on you. You're
not a threat to anybody. They could've grabbed him right
then.

Then he went to the lounge, and they didn't grab him at the lounge. They did, though, right? That's what we learned. They didn't want to grab him at the lounge. They wanted to grab him just as he was boarding that plane. And why is that significant? Who was going to grab him? Not the FBI alone, not an FBI agent wearing an FBI uniform wearing a big jacket. You heard that. They weren't doing that. The agent was actually carrying a visitor pass. He mentioned CBP. It was two CBP agents went up with this agent.

I've flown before, and I'm not, you know, putting this into evidence, but people do get stopped getting on the airplane. And when they get stopped on the airplane, getting on, the inference you can draw is because it's

something to do with why they're leaving, not that they've been accused of committing a crime 3 or 4 or 5, 10 years ago. It's totally unrelated to their visit in Las Vegas; totally unrelated to anything that's happened in the last year or two, and that's what this indictment is about. I don't think we should lose focus of the indictment which deals with crimes that date years back. Okay? Years back. And the biggest thing in Marcus Hutchins' life at that point was he had stopped the WannaCry virus. That made him an international celebrity. And guess what they focus on when they questioned him? They talk about WannaCry. They're questioning him about that. That has nothing to do with this indictment. It has nothing to do with the arrest warrant. He's been lauded by the White House for his role in that, in stopping that.

And so when you actually listen to this tape -- we want you to listen to the audio recording, this partial audio recording, the part of the audio recording that starts within 30 seconds, Your Honor -- and you should listen to this very closely -- he whispers, "What's this about?"

And what does the agent say? She doesn't say,

"Oh, actually, you know what? This is about this arrest

warrant, and here's this indictment, and here's what you've

been charged, and now we want to talk about all these

things."

No. She says, "Oh, in fact, we'll get to that later."

"We'll get to that later." That's hiding the ball. You can't waive rights if you hide the ball. And that's what we talk about in our briefing. If you look at that Fourth Circuit case, the Giddens case, it doesn't just involve IRS agents fooling people about their tax returns. That's not what that case is about at all. I'm going to ask Your Honor to read that case very closely because what happened there is what happened here, to a large extent.

Mr. Hutchins was fooled. And so when you listen to the tape, what you'll hear -- what Mr. Stiller did stay -- you're right -- he is talking pretty loosely. He does sound kind of natural. He does joke around a little bit. Why would he be like that? Because he doesn't know what's going on. He doesn't know why they're questioning him. He's been totally deceived. In fact, you hear that throughout the tape. He asked more than once: "What's this about," in effect.

And it's not until well over an hour into the interview, an hour after everything they really want out of him, that they show him the arrest warrant.

And I would draw your attention, Your Honor, to that point in time. We'll put it in our briefing. But here's what happens. And it's Special Agent Chartier, the

agent who said he showed him the arrest warrant. He didn't show him the arrest warrant before that moment. Because what you'll hear him say on the tape is, "Okay. Well, here's the arrest warrant. And just to be honest -- just to be honest, hey, now I'm going to tell you the truth."

"If I'm being honest with you, Marcus, this has absolutely nothing to do with WannaCry."

He had already spilled his guts to them is what the Government is going to argue. And now at this moment, over an hour into it, this agent saying, "Hey, guess what?

I'll be honest with you now because it has nothing to do with WannaCry." You cannot effectively waive your rights if that's the case. If agents are deceiving you about that, you can't.

And do you know how he also didn't know that he was waiving his rights and what the real significance was, and its significance, when they fooled him, and they set out to fool him, was when you listen to those jail calls, Your Honor. Again, you should listen to them, and listen to both of them because in those jail calls, it's very clear he doesn't know why he's here, why he's being held in jail. He doesn't understand the American system. He doesn't know why he's been exhausted.

And on the last call he makes on that last transcript, you'll see, Your Honor, this is after midnight.

He's talking to his boss. And what he says in there -- and I'm just going to read from the transcript that they provided, and it's now evidence. But I ask you to listen to the tape because that's the accurate version -- but what he says is, "So I'm not really sure what is going on, but I don't think it is just some shit I did in, like, 2005."

Excuse me my French.

He doesn't know what's going on. Even after he's been in jail he still doesn't know.

Now, if they want you to draw connections by what he knew, then you should equally be willing to focus on that statement.

And so when you talk about deception, Your Honor, you can't fool somebody into waiving their rights. And when you look at the sequence of events, at what happened here, that's exactly what happened because what did we learn? At 1:17, he was arrested. The agents both testified to that. That's in their surveillance log you have.

Guess when they say they had him sign the rights?
1:18.

Agent Butcher puts a little bit of an approximation on it. That's a minute later. Even if you give her her 10 minutes, at 1:17 they were up in the club lounge. They supposedly walked him into the stairwell. This is what Agent Chartier said. He told him he was under

Case 2:17-cr-00124-JPS Filed 05/22/18 Page 208 of 222 Document 82

arrest. They put him in handcuffs. This is Agent Chartier. Then they take him downstairs, right? A few minutes are passing. Then supposedly they have him sign these forms, and Agent Chartier and Agent Butcher disagree on this point, and it's critical.

Agent Chartier lied, Your Honor. I don't say that light, but he lied. Okay? They did not show him this arrest warrant at that time. It's clear from his own statement later in the tape he didn't.

And Agent Butcher said, "No," the two things he was shown, the Advice of Rights and the 1001 warning, and then we proceeded. And that's critical.

Even if you believe the arrest warrant thing, the arrest warrant doesn't even talk about really what's happening here. He wasn't shown it then. At most, as soon as he was possibly shown it, was an hour into it. And so in that, from 1:17 to 1:18, they apparently did all these things. And what do they say they did? They orally gave him, they claim, his Miranda rights and why that form is so critical. No, both of them testified it was read to him.

His whole basis for the rights was them allegedly reading the rights, him reading it and then him signing it.

That is not a quick process, Your Honor. Look at that form.

You cannot walk from whatever level you were at that airport, arrest him in the hallway, drag him all the way

down the stairs and do all those things and ask him about whether he's been drinking and his state of mind in a few minutes. It didn't happen that way.

They rushed him through. I think you can draw this inference from the evidence. And whenever he signed that form -- if he signed it at that point, it was quick. I'm not saying that you should draw that inference from the evidence.

So I think what -- you step back, and you look at his record, and we'll submit a briefing, we'll be able to lay this out for you, the sequence but also what happened here. And I would direct your attention when the agents testified. Obviously, you're allowed to evaluate their credibility on the stand, and I think you should.

Agent Chartier was defensive. That was clear to everyone in this courtroom. He got defensive. He got uptight. He got concerned, and he was giving long, rambling answers at various points, and that should be part of what you evaluate in this process.

Agent Butcher, God bless her, is just saying stuff. And what did we learn from her? What we learned, after they first prepped with these AUSAs, they got together and said, "Hey, let's get our stories in sync."

That's what she said. "We want to make sure we have the same facts."

That's not what they're supposed to do. The chips are supposed to be what they are. They're not supposed to sync up their stories. And even though they got together and tried to sync them up, we learned here today they didn't sync up because Agent Butcher said, "No, there was no arrest warrant, in effect, given to him when he was down there in that first few minutes. It was only provided an hour and 10

And I think, again, that is critical.

So I would ask Your Honor to look at the Giddens case, and we'll provide additional briefing on that, to focus on how that applies here, and that there was deception.

And we haven't walked away from any of our arguments. There's evidence in the record that he was exhausted. It's mentioned on the tape. He doesn't need to testify to that. You hear his own voice on the tape. There's evidence in the record that he would've been partying and could've been on drugs, and he could've not just been drinking. So the fact that they just asked him about drinking doesn't preclude anything else. And you heard Agent Butcher said, "Hey, you know what? Drinking one drink, one single drink, that's important to whether he's waiving his rights."

Well, anything else would be equally as important

minutes into things."

if not more important. And so they chose when they thought he might've ordered one drink, and it was just a Coca-Cola, they yanked him out and arrested him.

When your Honor steps back and looks at all this and looks at how it played out and the sequence of events, it's very clear that Mr. Hutchins was not properly Mirandized, did not properly waive those rights, and that any statements he gave subsequent to that should be excluded, should be suppressed.

That's it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Klein, you can sit down for my question or stand up. It's up to you. Just a quick question.

So in deciding whether Mr. Hutchins voluntarily waived Miranda rights, focusing on Exhibit 9, the Miranda Rights form, is my task -- I believe it is, and I want you to correct me if I'm wrong -- is my task, as I understand, to make a determination whether the rights were given and Mr. Hutchins had an opportunity to waive them or decline to waive them prior to questioning, or is my task to make a finding as to a specific time?

So said differently, is my task the sequence of events; that is, Miranda warnings first and then questioning, or do you believe my task is a specific time that -- to make a finding regarding specific time that the

warnings were given and waived?

MR. KLEIN: Well, I think regardless of the time, Your Honor, what you find there, you could find the other way and it's suppressed.

So I think, Your Honor, in looking at the record, we'll ask you to look at both things and to draw inferences on both based on the evidence you heard today, or based on the direct evidence. So I wouldn't say it's just to find out the time. Because if you look at the Giddens case, Your Honor, and I've asked -- again, I know you will look at it -- in that case, someone did, quote, waive their rights, right, end quotes, but it wasn't a valid waiver because they were fooled.

And so you could find, for example, in this case, yes, this was Mr. Hutchins' signature, and he did sign it before it started, but it could still be an invalid waiver.

Does that answer your question?

THE COURT: It does.

MR. KLEIN: So I think -- And, Your Honor, we will brief your question. Now that you've asked it, we'll make sure it's included in our briefing.

THE COURT: You've answered my question. So you can submit -- I will read everything you submit, but it was not an invitation for more briefing. There's plenty of briefing on this specific motion, so don't feel obligated to

1 delve into it because you answered the question. 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: And I think it was a very focused 4 question. 5 MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Rebuttal from the Government since the 7 Government has the burden? 8 MR. CHMELAR: Sure. I want to start with where 9 you ended with Mr. Klein. They've never argued to the 10 contrary that he was given Miranda. So your question posed 11 to Mr. Klein, "Is the timing important?" They've never 12 argued the timing is important. None of their filings to 13 get to this point suggested there was some sort of 14 after-the-fact Miranda advisement post-interview. They've 15 never alleged that, and so for them to now allege it is 16 simply unfounded. Nothing supported it. 17 So I would say the focus -- I know you didn't ask 18 the Government. The focus is whether or not he was given 19 Miranda and he understood it under the case law in the 20 Seventh Circuit in the context of the Advice of Rights form. 21 And I want to go and shift a little bit to the 22 responsibility --23 THE COURT: Of course, whether it was given prior 24 to the questioning. 25 MR. CHMELAR: Well, of course. I don't think

that's -- my point, our point is I don't think -- and I stressed this during our initial argument -- no one has ever refuted that point. No one ever argued it was not given prior.

They're not arguing -- and I think if you look at their motion to get to this stage, they acknowledged it was given before the interview started, before the recording started. That's in their motion. So they've already taken a position.

And this is very much a case of moving the goal posts from the defense. They argued specific points. And, yes, the Government has a burden to show something finite that he was advised of his Miranda rights, and he waived those rights, and it was a voluntary and knowing waiver in that he — the statement was voluntarily given.

They have a burden, too. And this argument about deceit -- the case law is clear, and as Mr. Klein implored you, read the cases. There's plenty of Seventh Circuit cases on this topic of deceit. There's nothing deceitful here. He was handcuffed and told he was under arrest on a federal warrant out of this district and then shown the arrest warrant.

They, the defense, has the burden on an argument of deceit under the law to show by clear and convincing evidence that he was deceived. That's the case law. And

that's true in the Seventh Circuit, and the defendant must prove the information -- the misinformation was material in his decision to speak to the agents. They haven't done that. They haven't come close to doing that. They've done nothing but allude to some idea that he was confused about what it was that he was being interviewed about. But both in the post-arrest interview and in the jail call, which Mr. Hutchins, the defense initially argued you shouldn't consider but appears now that they want you to consider it. On page 11 of the transcript, Mr. Hutchins states, quote, "Yeah, I knew it was always going to come back. I just didn't think it would be so soon."

And he says something to the same effect during the post-arrest interview. He knows deep down what is going on and why he's there, and he's introduced to the idea and the topic of Kronos quite early into the interview.

So I want to make sure there's not a burden shifting situation going on here. We have a specific thing we need to show. We've established it. These arguments that they want to make about his confusion about UK, Miranda, or rights, there's been nothing established about that. His impairment, his inability to understand the Miranda, there's been nothing established about that. They've grasped on at the very last moment this idea of some sort of deceit which clearly does not apply to this

particular situation, and they failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that that situation is applicable and should be -- has been established by them as it is their burden.

The other argument that they made, I think, deserves to be addressed is the -- this idea that he somehow was confused about the American legal system. His question in the jail calls goes about is it even legal for them to keep a foreign national in custody?

It has nothing to do with his rights under

Miranda. It has to do about procedural aspects of what is

going to happen next. You know, in the court sequence, will

he continue to be detained?

There's a case we cite in our pre-evidentiary hearing memorandum. It's the Frank case out of the Ninth Circuit. It involves a Navajo Indian man who argued unsuccessfully that his lack of experience with the American U.S. legal system negated his Waiver of Rights because he didn't understand the U.S. legal system. And that was wholly rejected by the Ninth Circuit. So the idea that he has to be fully familiar with the legal system does not exist. That's not a burden, and it never has been. We'd have trouble arresting foreign nationals in every single case. In every single investigation, we'd have to show they were aware of the U.S. legal system.

The case law on waiver of Miranda is quite clear and is established in our brief. So we would argue that we've established what we need to establish to have the statement admitted and not suppressed. And the defendant, despite these lobbing allegations related to agents lying and intoxication, impairment, confusion, have established nothing except some inconsistencies and unfortunate circumstances and situations that developed during the interview, like a failure to start the recording at the very outset and the altering of the times.

So with that, Judge, we would rest and ask you to deny their motion.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Okay. So this ends this hearing. The motion is under advisement subject to any supplementals to be submitted by Wednesday, May  $30^{ ext{th}}$ .

I implore counsel not to open the door to new arguments. The idea of keeping the record open for these two weeks is to give you an opportunity to supplement some thoughts or some authority that you think is so clearly on point that I may have, not missed, but it's not too -- we're not starting new rounds of motion at all in this matter. So I want to make that very, very clear to counsel here.

With that, then, Mr. Klein, is there anything further for this evening?

MR. KLEIN: No, Your Honor. Just -- no.

THE COURT: Mr. Chmelar?

MR. CHMELAR: No. I spoke with Mr. Proctor.
Mr. Proctor has nothing either.

THE COURT: Okay. And I assure the parties, I do read everything. I do listen to everything that you -- I will, and I do. It's my way of working, but I assure you that I will listen to everything submitted and read everything that you submit and issue a decision in this matter.

Thank you.

Because it's after hours, you will need assistance in leaving the building; otherwise, you won't be able to leave. So you can take your time to pack your things. My staff can assist you in getting out the side door, or perhaps the Government attorneys can let you out the door. So I'll let you decide. And also the members of the audience as well, we will need to let you out as well. So if you want to sit tight, give us a couple minutes, we can escort you out.

MR. CHMELAR: Judge, I did have one thing that your comment about listening to the recordings reminded me about. And I think we conveyed it to Your Honor's clerk that the jail recording, the audio comes out high on one speaker, low on another speaker, and there's the ability to

1 adjust that and move the needles the opposite direction. Ιt 2 could be somewhat difficult to find. Our lit support 3 offered their assistance to the extent you request any; 4 otherwise, we just assume that you have the ability to find 5 someone to assist you, but our litigation support person 6 indicated he would be more than willing to adjust the audio, 7 if necessary. 8 THE COURT: Okay. I will see if I need any help. 9 We'll figure it out. 10 And, Mr. Proctor, you also have the other jail 11 call and transcript that you're going to admit. Let's give 12 those a number so that we're keeping track of everything. 13 MR. CHMELAR: Yeah, Judge. The transcript is 14 Exhibit 10, and the recording, underlying recording, is 15 Exhibit 3. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, the new jail call, will 18 that be a different exhibit number? 19 MR. CHMELAR: It's 3. 20 MR. KLEIN: 3? 21 THE COURT: Yeah. The transcript is --22 MR. CHMELAR: Is 10. 23 THE COURT: Is 10 and the audio is 3? 24 MR. CHMELAR: Correct. 25 THE COURT: Okay. So the record is clear.

```
you everyone. Have a good evening.
 1
 2
                  MR. CHMELAR: Thank you, Judge.
                  MR. KLEIN: Thank you.
 3
             (Hearing concluded.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	I, Richard D. Ehrlich, a Registered Merit Reporter
5	and Certified Realtime Reporter, certify that the foregoing
6	is a true, complete, and accurate transcript of the
7	proceedings ordered to be transcribed in the above-entitled
8	case before the Honorable Nancy Joseph, in Milwaukee,
9	Wisconsin, on May 16, 2018.
10	
11	s/Richard D. Ehrlich May 21, 2018
12	Richard D. Ehrlich, Official Court Reporter
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	